

VOL. XXXVIII, 4

WHOLE No. 152

JAN 7 1918.
UNIV. OF MICH.
LIBRARY

AMERICAN

JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

EDITED BY

BASIL LANNEAU GILDERSLEEVE

HONORARY FRANCIS WHITE PROFESSOR OF GREEK IN THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

AND

CHARLES WILLIAM EMIL MILLER

PROFESSOR OF GREEK IN THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

OCTOBER, NOVEMBER, DECEMBER

1917

BALTIMORE: B. L. GILDERSLEEVE

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS, AGENTS

LONDON: ARTHUR F. BIRD

PARIS: ALBERT FONTENAY

LEIPZIG: F. A. BROCKHAUS

CONTENTS.

I.—The St. Gall Glossary. By W. M. LINDSAY,	349
II.—Vediovis, The Volcanic God. A Reconstruction. By A. L. FROTHINCHAM,	370
III.—An Oxford Scholar. By BASIL L. GILDERSLEEVE,	392
IV.—Greek Inscriptions in the Royal Ontario Museum. By W. SHERWOOD FOX,	411
V.—Reduplication in Tagalog. By FRANK R. BLAKE,	425
VI.—Slavic <i>togo</i> . By E. PROKOSCH,	432
REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES:	435
Quackenbos, The Sanskrit Poems of Mayūra.—Wells, A Manual of the Writings in Middle English, 1050-1400.—Dottin, Les Anciens Peuples de l'Europe.—The Arden Shakespeare.—Gummere, Seneca: ad Lucilium Epistolæ Morales.	
REPORTS:	447
Hermes.—Rivista di Filologia.	
BRIEF MENTION,	454
RECENT PUBLICATIONS,	463
BOOKS RECEIVED,	465
INDEX,	467

Open to original communications in all departments of philology, classical, comparative, oriental, modern; condensed reports of current philological work; summaries of chief articles in the leading philological journals of Europe; reviews by specialists, bibliographical lists. Four numbers constitute a volume, one volume each year. Subscription price \$3.00 a year (foreign postage 50 cents), payable to the publisher in advance; single numbers, \$1.00 each. Suitable advertisements will be inserted at the following rates:

	1 TIME.	2 T.	3 T.	4 T.
One page	\$16 00	\$30 00	\$40 00	\$50 00
Half page	8 00	15 00	20 00	25 00
Quarter page	4 00	8 00	12 00	15 00
Eighth page	2 00	4 00	6 00	8 00

SPECIAL NOTICE.—The stock of complete sets of THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY has passed over into the hands of the undersigned. These sets will be sold for the present at the reduced price of \$77, for the thirty-eight volumes, cash to accompany the order. Single volumes, \$3 (foreign postage, 50 cents); single numbers, \$1 each; reprints of articles ten cents each, so far as they can be supplied. Address,

THE JOHN HOPKINS PRESS, Baltimore, Md.

Published quarterly. Three dollars a year (foreign postage, 50 cents).

The Lord Baltimore Press

BALTIMORE, MD., U. S. A.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XXXVIII, 4

WHOLE No. 152.

I.—THE ST. GALL GLOSSARY.

This glossary is known to American Latinists from Prof. Minton Warren's monograph (Cambridge, 1885). I propose in this paper a discussion of its relation to Festus' epitome of Verrius Flaccus.

Goetz in his *Thesaurus Glossarum Emendatarum* has provided an apparatus criticus for editing Latin glosses. We find there the various forms which a gloss has taken in different glossaries, e. g. *Falarica* (1) genus *hastae grandis*, (2) genus *arte (arcae) grandis*, (3) genus *argente (-ti) grandis*, (4) genus *artis grandis*; *Agea* (1) *uta (leg. via) gyrum navis*, (2) *recurrens unda*, (3) *via navis in aqua dextra laevaque*. But how are we to determine the 'archetype' form, the form which it had in the original source? Through the shifting sand of glossary tradition how can we reach the bed-rock? A paper in the (English) *Journal of Philology* reveals three original sources: (1) the true *Placidus Glossary (Plac.)*, (2) the so-called 'shorter glosses of Placidus', which I propose to call the *pseudo-Placidus Glossary (ps.-Plac.)*, (3) what I call the *Abolita Glossary (Abol.)*, the glosses enclosed in square brackets in *Corp. Gloss. Lat.* IV pp. 4-198, beginning with the item (4, 5) *Abolita: abstersa vel deleta*. The history of the first two is sketched in this style (*Journ. Phil.* of 1917):

Some pupil of Placidus arranged in alphabetical order (by A-, not AB-) the notes he had taken of his master's lectures and published them as a glossary (*Plac.*). Some owner of this glossary incorporated with it a collection of the brief marginal

notes entered in texts of the early Republican writers. This collection (ps.-Plac.) presented each word in the actual form which it bore in the text and arranged the words in the order of their occurrence in the text. The person who transferred its glosses to his MS of the Placidus Glossary made a pause after finishing the P-glosses (perhaps because he found no Q-section in Plac.) and never resumed his task. This MS of his was the one and only transmitter of the ps.-Plac. glossary to us.

The history of the third, the Abolita Glossary, I take to be this. In the seventh century (towards its close?) some monastery-teacher in Spain took from the shelves of the monastery-library a copy of Festus and decided to make a glossary out of it. He found however that it did not provide enough of suitable material and, after he had filled a number of pages with excerpts from its lemmas, looked about for a means of completing his design. He ordered some (young and ignorant) monk to copy out the brief marginal notes in the library text of Virgil, of Terence, of Apuleius and of at least two (unknown) Christian authors, and to set them (each in the order of its occurrence) in the glossary. The Virgil volume provided a mass of marginalia, especially in the opening books of the Aeneid. It was a volume akin to that from whose marginalia was compiled the Virgil Glossary printed in vol. IV (pp. 427 sqq.) of the *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum*. The common source of both had, for example, at Aen. 6, 395 the marginal note, *Tartareum custodem: canem tricipitem* (with the gloss *Cerberum*); and this has produced the strange item, *Tartareum custodem: canem tricerberum tricipitem*. The word 'chorus' in Geo. 4, 460 had, I think, the marginal note (which betrays a monastery-teacher's hand), *Chorus: multitudo, Corus: modii X* (see *Thes. Gloss. s. vv. chorus, corus, modix*). The Apuleius volume (possibly including some works now lost) did not provide so many marginalia as the Terence; but any scraps from a 7th century Spanish MS of Apuleius (or of Terence) are welcome.¹ For example, 'concupulassent' (not 'compilassent')

¹ Gnuég's dissertation 'de glossis Terentianis codicis Vaticani 3321' I have not been able to see and cannot say whether he has recognized 'rebamini' (not 'verebamini') as the reading in Phorm. 901. The Virgil glosses of Abolita are being investigated. Will anyone who has leisure and inclination for an investigation of the Apuleius glosses

seems to have been its reading in Met. 9, 2; 'satagentes' (not 'satis agentes') in Met. 8, 17. All glossaries drift into alphabetical arrangement sooner or later: this one would be likely to assume an AB-order very soon, for that order would be suggested by the Festus glosses on its opening pages. It was at some time or other incorporated with a different collection, the Abstrusa Glossary, and took from its new neighbour a movement towards an ABC-order. In this composite form it has come down to us; and although its items are in our two good MSS kept distinct from those of Abstrusa (*Abstr.*), the alphabetical re-arrangement has so broken up the original batches of Virgil glosses, Terence glosses, etc., that we are often at a loss to detect them. But not always. For example, in the SU-section (C. G. L. IV, p. 180) we find (no. 42) Subservias: subeas, quiescas (from Andr. 735) followed by (no. 43) Susurrat: murmurat (from Andr. 779), then by (no. 44) <Substat>: subsistit, sufficit, praevallet (from Andr. 914). Now a 10th century glossary offers (C. G. L. V 514, 23) Subserviat: subeat, quiescat. We recognize the item to be derived from the Abolita gloss, the ultimate source, the gloss taken directly from Terence marginalia (cf. IV 69, 38 and V 454, 24; IV 79, 19-20 and V 458, 16-17).

The Festus glosses of Abolita are treated in an article not yet published. In this one I will discuss a glossary derived in part from the composite Abstrusa-Abolita and able to throw light on the correct form of the Abolita Festus glosses and, I think, to add to their number.

An apograph will be found in C. G. L. IV, pp. 201 sqq. of the St. Gall MS (no. 912), written at St. Gall in rude uncials of apparently the 8th century. So the MS may be of about the same age as our oldest MS of Abolita (Vat. lat. 3321). It is a mere pocket-copy, hastily prepared, not by any means a 'codex archetypus ad cuius exemplaria sunt reliqui corrigendi' (to quote the famous entry in the Bamberg Cassiodorus), and we must fix our minds on the lost exemplar from which it was transcribed, on the work of the compiler rather than of the transcriber. The glossary (*Sangall.*) consists in part, perhaps the

kindly write to me. No special knowledge is required for this small piece of work but merely (since there is no suitable lexicon) some hunting for words through Apuleius' pages.

larger part, of Abstrusa and Abolita glosses, not mechanically transcribed by an ignorant monk (as were the Virgil and Terence marginalia culled for Abolita) but selected by an intelligent compiler, who did not hesitate to make a single patchwork item out of two or more items of his exemplar (e. g. 260, 42 combines two Abolita glosses with two Abstrusa; 253, 10 an Abol. and an Abstr.) and even to re-cast the form of a gloss-word or its interpretation when he thought proper (cf. 296, 12 with 193, 25). Its evidence for the correct form of a Festus gloss of Abolita must therefore be used with caution. To illustrate from a Virgil gloss: the note at Aen. I, 497 in the margin of that annotated edition (or MS) of Virgil which was the ultimate source of the Virgil Glossary as well as of the Abolita Virgil glosses was (465, 3) *Stipante caterva: cingente multitudine*. In Abolita the interpretation lost its initial letter, and in the Vatican MS we find an attempt to improve the reading (176, 31 *ingente multitudine collecti*). The compiler of our glossary found the same faulty form of the interpretation in his Abstr.-Abol. MS. He tried conjectural emendation, (286, 38) *Stipante caterva: comprimente multitudine*. But since Festus (p. 182 of the small Teubner text) treats *Nictare* (and *Nictari*), our glossary's *Nectari* (261, 37) is probably truer to the archetype than the *Necturi* (123, 39) of the Vatican (*Vat.*) and Monte Cassino (*Cass.*) MSS of the composite Abstr.-Abol. glossary. Perhaps the corruption of the rest of the gloss is due to that characteristic 'causa erroris' in Glossary MSS, capricious suspension (see my *Notae Latinae*, p. 416). In the archetype, I fancy, stood *Nectari oculorum frequenti aper(tione)*. This has become in *Vat.* and *Cass.* *Necturi oculorum frequentia*; in *Sangall.* *Nectari oculorum frequentia aperiri*. Where our MS is the most helpful is in the cases where *Cass.* offers (in the Abolita portions) a gloss omitted by *Vat.* These present great difficulty, for while *Cass.* is full of interpolations on the one hand, *Vat.* on the other undoubtedly omits many glosses (e. g. Abstrusa glosses), partly long glosses (awkward for an uncial glossary) by design, partly short glosses by inadvertence.

Our MS, by its re-casting, (290, 30) *Trabea: vestis senatoria purpurea*, claims for Abolita a long gloss of *Cass.* which is omitted by *Vat.*, (187, 17b *Trabea: vestis senatoria ex purpura et cocco, unde trabeatus dicitur qui ea utitur*). This long

Festus (?) gloss of Abolita was shortened by the compiler; but another long Festus gloss of Abolita (186, 43) was shortened by the scribe of the pocket-copy, (290, 27) *Trasenna: tegula* <a>perta qua lumen venit (the other MSS admit the full form). Short glosses would easily be overlooked in any rearrangement of a large number into stricter alphabetical order (cf. *Class. Quart.* 6, 92 n.) and, as we have seen, *Vat.* exhibits Abolita in transition from the AB- to the ABC- stage. Our glossary too bears signs of departure from its original arrangement; for 214, 3 (*Calamaularius: ipse qui de canna canit*) must have stood immediately after 213, 43 (*Calamaula: canna de qua canitur*), and 250, 16 (*Inlectant: quod supra*) after 249, 52 (*Inliciunt: inlicita persuadent*), as in *Abstrusa* (94, 51-52). That common error of glossary-transcription, the fusion of two lemmas, shews us that a co- and a ca-word were originally neighbours, (220, 51) *Compernes* and *Calcitrone*s, whereas an AB- or ABC-order now prevails throughout the work. Evidently no inference from its present order is safe.

The nature of the compilation, in particular the treatment of the *Abstr.-Abol.* glosses, may be illustrated from two short portions:

I. (the vo-words, p. 296, nos. 41 sqq.)—(no. 41) *Volumen: liber, a volvendo dict.*; (no. 42) *Voluntas: mens*; (no. 43) *Vorat: sorbet* (cf. *Abstr.* 195, 38 *Vorax: sorbens*; 195, 40 *Vorat: gluttit*); (no. 44) *Volvit pectore cogitat* (? cf. *Abol.* 195, 34 *Volvere: cogitare*); (no. 45) *Volubilitas mentis: varietas m(entis)*; (no. 46) *Voluptas: concupiscentia*; (no. 47) *Volutabra: loca in quibus se porci volutantur* (? cf. *Abol.* 195, 39 *Volutabra: lacunae in quibus iumenta volutantur*); (no. 48) *Volucres: veloces* (cf. *Abol.* 195, 36-37 *Volucres: aves, Volucrem: velociter fluentem*, a Virgil gloss on *Aen.* I, 317); (no. 49) *Vola: manus cava in medio, unde involare dicimus* (? cf. *Abol.* 195, 28 *Vola: pars manus cava in medio*); (no. 50) *Vorago: absorptio et fossa profunda et terrae hiatus* (cf. *Abol.* 195, 49-50 *Vorago: absorptio, Voraginem: barathrum*); (no. 51) *Vosmet: vos ipsos* (= *Abstr.* 195, 42); (no. 52) *Vociferatur: clamat*; (no. 53) *Vovet: promittit* (= *Abstr.* 195, 44); (no. 54) *Voetema* (*leg. Βοήθημα*): *adiutoria* (cf. *Abstr.* 195, 19 *Voetema: adiutoria; graecum est*); (297, 1) *Voti compos: memor. EXPL(icit) DE VO* (? cf. *Abol.* 195,

46 *Voti compos*: *consentaneus votis* [*compositus voti*]). The last item (which concludes the *vo*-glosses) shews us that the exemplar was divided into sections, with headings like *INC(ipit) DE VO* (as in *Vat.*) and endings like *EXPL(icit) DE VO*.

II. (p. 278, col. i)—(no. 1) *Ramen<tum>*: *pulvis qui raditur de aliqua specie* (= *Abstr.* 159, 47; 'species' late Lat. for thing, sort of thing); (no. 2) *Randus* (*leg.* *Rapidus*): *velox, celer* (? cf. *Abstr.* 159, 50 *Rapidus*: *velox*); (no. 3) *Radicitus*: *funditus*; (no. 4) *Ramnensis* *tribus a Romulo constituta*; (no. 5) *Raca* (i. e. *ῥακά*, *Mat.* 5, 22): *inanis, vacuus, vanus*; (no. 6) *Rastri*: *ligones* (= *Abstr.* 160, 6); (no. 7) *Rava*: *rauca vel clausa* ('congested', of the throat); (no. 8) *Rebitere*: *redire*; (no. 9) *Radiat*: *splendet*; (no. 10) *Redimitus*: *coronatus, ornatus* (cf. *Abstr.* 161, 17–18 *Redimitus*: *coronatus, Redimiculum*: *ornamentum*); (no. 11) *Reticuit*: *tacuit* (a doublet of 279, 40); (no. 12) *Redimicula*: *retinacula* (= *Abol.* 163, 6); (no. 13) *Redivivum*: *a vetustate renovatum* (= *Abol.* 160, 46); (no. 14) *Redarguit*: *convincit, de reatu arguit* (= *Abstr.* 161, 13); (no. 15) *Redhibet*: *impensam sibi gratiam reddit* (= *Abstr.* 161, 15); (no. 16) *Redigitur*: *revocatur* (= *Abstr.* 161, 26); (no. 17) *Redactus*: *perductus*; (no. 18) *Redolet*: *bene olet* (= *Abol.* 162, 52); (no. 19) *Redhibitionem*: *retributionem*; (no. 20) *Reductum*: *retro ductum*; (no. 21) *Rediviva*: *renascentia* (= *Abstr.* 161, 28); (no. 22) *Redamat*: *amantem [se] mutuo dilig(it)* (= *Abstr.* 161, 14); (no. 23) *Reduvias*: *reliquias*; (no. 24) *Reduces*: *salvos, incolumes, reversos* (= *Abstr.* 161, 22); (no. 25) *Redintegrat*: *integrum restituit*; (no. 26) *Recludit*: *aperit et recludit* (cf. *Abstr.* 160, 34 *Recludit*: *aperit*); (no. 27) *Recenset*: *recitat, recognoscit* (cf. *Abstr.* 160, 33 *Recenset*: *numerat ā regit vel recognoscit*); (no. 28) *Recubat*: *accumbit*.

In these two samples the glosses taken from the composite *Abstr.-Abol.* glossary are decidedly more numerous than those taken from elsewhere. On some pages however the ratio is less unequal. The preponderance of the *Abstr.* over the *Abol.* items is a puzzling feature. It may be explained partly by the precedence of the *Abstr.* portions in the composite glossary; but I suspect also that the *Virgil* and *Terence* glosses were

marked (in the margin?) DE VIRG., DE TER., and that the compiler made a practice of ignoring them (or most of them) because his monastery-library already possessed special Virgil and Terence Glossaries (possibly written in the very volume in which the compilation was entered). Among those 'taken from elsewhere' (a convenient phrase which does not commit one to any theory that only one other composite glossary was used by the compiler, or that several simple glossaries were employed, or that part of his compilation was culled by himself from marginalia in the MSS of his monastery-library) we easily detect a Greek series: e. g. on p. 216 (no. 13) Casu: titixi (*leg. τῇ τύχῃ*); (no. 23) Amicum: ton filon (cf. no. 25). The word *μητρυνία* has puzzled the scribe, (262, 46) Noverca: matrea, id est matrinia. Since 'a Cadmean victory' is rather a Greek than a Latin phrase, we may suppose that the source of 215, 4 had *Καδμεία νίκη*: non bona. We may doubt whether the interpretation in 293, 39 (Turibulum: thymiaterium) would be written in Greek or in Latin form; or the gloss-word in the curious quintette, (211, 25) Brephotrophium: locus venerabilis in quo infantes aluntur, (262, 13) Nosocomium: locum venerabilem in quo infirmi homines curantur, (241, 35) Gerontocomium: locum venerabilem in quo, etc., (273, 43) Ptochotrophium: locus in quo, etc., (208, 21) Xenodochium: locum venerabilem in quo peregrini suscipi(untur). (The last appears in Cass., an interpolation apparently.) We need not hesitate to affirm that at least one source (immediate or ultimate) was a glossary 'utriusque linguae' in use at some monastery where Greek was spoken or studied, i. e. either in South Italy (such as Vivarium) or an Irish cloister (such as Bobbio near Milan¹). So while the one source of our glossary, the Abstr.-Abol. compound, came from Spain to Italy, this other source is Italian and not Spanish. (Isidore knew no Greek.) The MS most closely connected with the St. Gall codex was written at Bobbio in the beginning of the 9th century (c in Goetz' apparatus criticus). The two leading MSS of the Asbestos Glossary, which seems from Goetz' account to be practically identical with ours, were written

¹There is a gloss (255, 15) Liguria: provincia Italiae in qua est Mediolanum. It may have come from a marginal note in a text. So may the gloss (210, 38) Baltha: audax Gothice (e. g. on a proper name ending in -baldus).

(at the beginning of the 10th century) at Monte Cassino (*a* of Goetz) and, I think, in Central Italy (*b* of Goetz). A famous Latin-Greek glossary (wrongly ascribed to Philoxenus) is printed in vol. II of the *Corpus Glossariorum*, pp. 3-212. From Dammann's account (in *Commentationes Philologiae Ienenses*, 5, 1 sqq.), De Festo pseudo-Philoxeni auctore, we see that it provides 'archetype' glosses culled from Festus, etc. If we turn over its pages we realize what an enormous variety of pure Latin glosses might have come from such a source, and how the same bilingual item may have taken different forms from different compilers. On the first page of the bilingual glossary (*Philox.*) we find (no. 41) Abiugassere: ἀποζεύσαι. Our glossary offers (201, 16) Abiugassere: disiungere; another glossary, the AA Glossary, seems to have had (437, 4) Abiugassere abiugare dissolvere. Both the Sangall. and the AA interpretation may be different translations of the same Greek word. But while in the case of a rare early Republican form like 'abiugassere' we have a definite clue pointing to the actual use of *Philox.* by our compiler, we have none quite so clear in the case of other items on the same page: (no. 10) Abavus: προπάππον πατήρ (cf. 201, 2 Abavus: tritavi pater); (no. 13) Abdicat: ἀποκηρύσσει (cf. 202, 4 Abdicat: a se alienat); (no. 14) Abdidit: ἀπέκρυψεν, ἀπέκλεισεν (cf. 202, 6 Abdidit: occultavit); (no. 27) Abgrego: ἀπαγελάζω, διαχωρίζω (cf. 202, 7 Abgrego: separo, segrego. If the original order was 'segrego, separo', the identification can dispense with doubt); (no. 31) Abhorret: ἀποφρίττει, ἀπωδόν ἐστι (cf. 201, 33 Abhorret: dissonat, discrepat); (no. 33) Abigeus: ἀπελάτης (? cf. 201, 14 Abigeus: qui tollit rem alienam); (no. 34) Abigit: ἀπελαύνει, ἐκτιτρώσκει (cf. 201, 13 Abigit: proicit, minat. This is late Latin minare, French mener); (no. 37) Abit: ἀπέρχεται (cf. 201, 8 Abit: discedit). And yet we must allow the great probability that all these glosses are (like Abiugassere) derived from *Philox.*, unless it can be shewn, in this or that case, that some other source is more likely: e. g. the first item in our glossary, Abba: pater, may come from the gloss which stands in Cass. at the beginning of *Abstr.-Abol.*—Abba Syre (-rum), Graece pater etc.—rather than from the 26th item of *Philox.*, Abba: τέττα.

With two so prolific sources, *Abstr.-Abol.* and *Philox.*, we might hope to account for every item of our glossary. But such

a gloss as 292, 28 (Trieris: *navis magna*, de qua in Esaia 'non transibit per eam <trieris magna>') comes, with its neighbour (292, 29 Trieres: *naves magnae quas Graeci durcones vocant*), from Isidore (Etym. 19, 1, 10) Trieris, *navis magna quam Graeci durconem vocant; de qua in Esaia (33, 21) 'non transibit per eam trieris magna'*. Similarly no. 27 on the same page comes from Etym. 14, 6, 32 Sicilia . . . prius autem Trinacria dicta, etc. Now Isidore often reproduces the language of his authorities, e. g. Servius. Since we have established that Isidore was actually a source of our glossary, we must (on the principle 'Entia non sunt multiplicanda praeter necessitatem') refuse to ascribe to Servius any item which can be ascribed to Isidore; at least until Servius too has been proved to be a source.

Another thread easily detected is a feature of most medieval glossaries, items like (240, 40-41) Gabriel: *fortitudo Dei*, Galilaei: *volubiles*. These etymologies of Biblical names (culled from Jerome or Eucherius or directly from Isidore, etc.) often filled blank pages at the end of a glossary and would be incorporated with it at the next transcription. But a detailed analysis of the contents of Sangall. lies outside the scope of this article, which professes to be an investigation of the Festus glosses in this glossary.

Since Festus' work is fully preserved for the letters N, Q and (we may add) R, S, we had better begin our search for possible Festus glosses in these parts of Sangall. Of the borrowings from Abolita only those omitted in Vat., Cass. (or in Vat. alone) need be mentioned. An item found in a large number of glossaries, (261, 42) Nictit canis cum acute gannit, looks like an extract from Fest. 184 Nictit canis in odorandis ferarum vestigiis; ut Ennius . . . 'nictit ululatque ibi acute'; unde ipsa gannitio. The 'acute' is provided by the Ennius quotation. If this Festus gloss came from Abolita, it has been omitted by both Vat. and Cass. Paulus (s. v. Callim, 41, 6) mentions the Early Latin use of 'nis pro nobis'. Our glossary offers (261, 51) Nis: nobis. A weaker claimant to a Festus connexion is (261, 30) Neque: non (cf. Fest. 158 Nec coniunctionem . . . positam esse ab antiquis pro non). Nocticula: luna (262, 21) may come from Philox. 134, 17 (Nocticula: 'Εκάτη νυκτοφαίνουσα) where the explanation νυκτοφαίνουσα demands Noctiluca.

This is however not found in the N-section nor in any other extant part of Festus and may be one of the many Horace glosses of Philox. Nusciosus (262, 39) comes from Abstrusa, and there is no evidence that Abstrusa contains Festus glosses. Nepa: vipera (261, 11) does not suit Festus' definition (162 cancer vel, ut quidam, scorpios).

In the Q-section no item need be mentioned. In the R-section there is no counterpart in Abolita of (278, 4) Ram-nensis tribus a Romulo constituta. Its form does not suggest Philox. as the source. On the same page stands (no. 7) Rava: rauca vel clausa. It would suggest Festus more strongly if the gloss were Rava vox (cf. Fest. 354 Ravam vocem). After it comes an Early Latin gloss (no. 8) Rebitere: redire (quite in the form of Philox. items), but this verb (simple and compound) is a stock topic of glossaries. In the R-section of Festus there is no mention of 'rebitere'.

Of the R-items of ps.-Plac. only one, I think, has survived, Rediviam: redivivam (s. v. Excetra 21, 11), but the writer of the preface in the Salmasian Anthology uses an Inf. reduviare. It would be rash to connect this with our gloss (278, 23) Reduvias: reliquias. We should have to suppose that he wrote 'me . . . eandem normam reduviare compellit' and got his imaginary *reduviare* 'relinquere' through mistaking *reduvias* for 2 Sing. of a verb of the First Conjugation. On p. 280 we find (no. 35) Rorarius: miles qui primo in bello pugnam committit. This suits Paulus' extract (323 Rorarios milites vocabant, etc.) from Festus' missing lemma, and the use of the Nom. Sing., the case exhibited in both of Lucilius' lines (290 and 393), favours this claimant. Was it an Abolita gloss omitted by Vat. and Cass.? There is an absurd combination (280, 45) Ruma: mamma, al(iter) pugna. We need not attribute it to the compiler. He may quite well have kept separate, as other glossaries do, Ruma and Runa. He may too have added to the latter, as they do, Runata; for Runata would easily drop out after Runa. The problem has been much discussed and remains unsolved, but the combined evidence of the three witnesses (the St. Gall Glossary, the AA Glossary, the glossary of Vat. lat. 1471) certainly points to the existence of two items drawn from that lost lemma of Festus which Paulus excerpted thus: (317) Runa genus teli significat; Ennius 'ru-

nata recedit', id est proeliata. Of the discrepancy in Paulus' excerpt between 'genus teli' and 'proeliata' we find no hint in the glossaries (Runa: pugna), unless the interpretation of Runata in the AA Glossary (suspicata) is a corruption of *spiculata* 'having hurled spicula' (like *iaculata* 'having hurled iacula'). Were these two (Runa and Runata) Abolita glosses omitted by Vat. and Cass.? Did the compiler of Abolita find in his (Spanish) MS of Festus genus belli (as Landgraf suggested)? Or was his actual extract merely Runata: proeliata; a runa? Certainly the AA Glossary used a good MS of Abstr.-Abol. and got from it several Festus glosses omitted by Vat. and Cass. To complete the discussion it must be mentioned that the Glossae Nominum, which draw mostly from Philox., offer (591, 43) Runa: stipula (*leg* spiculum?, spicula?).

After Marx' explanation of Lucilius' gibe we cannot connect 282, 44 (Status: statura) with Lucil. 794. And 283, 45 (Septimontium: dies festus urbis Romae, quia super septem montes sedet) is not identical with Fest. 458; nor yet 289, 56 (Suove-aurilia) with Fest. 372. The true form of 284, 41 may be Sicile: sutor<i>um. There is an Abolita gloss, (180, 46) Sutfarcinatus: sub brachio caricatus (French chargé), from a Terence batch already mentioned. (The next gloss, from Andr. 181, should be Oscitantes: dormientes.) But our glossary (288, 12) seems to have the actual case found in Terence's line (Andr. 770) Subfascinatam: succinctu (-tam?) armatam. That points rather to a source like Philox., as does the variety in 'he interpretation (from a Greek word?) in the Munich fragment (subalatus). The scribal error of Haplography might be made responsible for (288, 33) Sucerda: stercus ovile (cf. Fest. 390 Sucerdae, stercus suillum, etc.). There is no Abolita gloss, but the form would suit a source like Philox. The variant readings in Plautus Most. 765 lend interest to the items of Abstrusa 177, 12 (Sub divo: in rure, sub patenti caelo) and our glossary (287, 51) Sub sudo: sub caelo. The second hand in a 10th century MS (C. G. L. V 514, 5) combines the pair, Sub <s>udo: sub caelo, sub divo. We have a faint suggestion of Festus in 283, 28 Scirpus: iuncus, unde calamauci fiunt (cf. Fest. 444 Scirpus est id quod in palustribus locis nascitur, leve et procerum, unde tegetes fiunt, etc.); and Festus often discusses proper names like (282, 32) Scaurus: cuius calx

extrinsecus eminent et pedes introrsus incurvi sunt. Isidore (Etym. 12, 3, 2) may be the source of 282, 8 Saur<ic>es (Saurex?): sorices (sorex?). We may notice also (281, 32) Salentinus (-nos?): Calabrienses (-sis?), and (281, 47) Sarissa: genus teli Macedonici (? cf. Fest. 440 and 422).

For the other letters between M and U the loss of about one half of Festus makes us grope in the dark more than ever. Noteworthy are (258, 11) Messala: agricola, messor, (258, 8-9) Mediastinus: balneator; nam prius mediustinus dictus, quasi in media ustione positus. And there are two suggestions of Festus: (257, 12) Macilentus: macer, (258, 14) Mergi (-ae): fustes quibus messes colliguntur (cf. Paul. 111). But (258, 10) Me[ta]castor is hardly Me ita Castor. Rather the scribe first wrote ta for ca and left his mistake uncorrected. Much has been made of the supposed Early Latin gloss (243, 27) Helitores: hortulani. And yet it is a mere doublet of what we find in the O-section (264, 31) Oletores: hortulani. Both are rude St. Gall transcriptions of the same Abstrusa gloss (132, 10) Olitores: hortulani. Festus is suggested by (265, 29) Opiter: natus avo patre non vivo, post patris mortem natus (cf. Paul. 201 Opiter est cuius pater avo vivo mortuus est, ducto vocabulo aut quod obitu patris genitus sit aut quod avum ob patrem habeat, id est pro patre). Not so strongly by its neighbour (265, 30) Opiparum: beatum, opulentum (? cf. Paul. 207 Opiparum, magnarum opum apparatus), and by (263, 57) Obstipum: obliquum, inaequale[m] (the Lucretius line in Fest. 210 might explain 'inaequale'); similarly by the last half of 265, 7 (Oppidanus) apud antiquos oppida dicta sunt quod opem darent (cf. Fest. 222, 5).

In the P-section the gloss Paludamenta has been broken into two parts (266, 43+267, 6) Paludamenta: ornamenta militum; unde hi qui in provinciam proficiscunt paludati vocantur. A disease mentioned by Paulus (247 Patagus, morbi genus) is subject of a gloss (268, 6) Patago: genus morbi. The often quoted 267, 30 (Pancra: rapina) is an Abstrusa gloss (137, 9). Notice (272, 46) Piacularis hostia: quae offe(rtur) pro peccato. The (apparently) Festus gloss 272, 30 (Pipat: conviciatur, queritur ut passer) suggests that in Abolita the item, (143, 16) Pipatio: clamor pipantis (putantis MSS), was preceded by this item, which has dropped out in Vat. and Cass.

The second half of 272, 34, *Pyxides: vasa modica argentea vel lignea, quas vulgus 'buxides' dicunt* (French *boîte*), may belong to the full version of *Abstrusa*, 144, 6 (whence it passed to C. G. L. V 93, 7), unless it comes from *Isidore* (Etym. 20, 7, 3 *Pyxides, vascula unguentaria ex buxo facta; nam quod nos buxum Graeci pyxum vocant*), just as the second half of 296, 41 *Vola* (mentioned above) may come from Etym. 17, 7, 67.

Isidore (Etym. 19, 2, 5) seems the source of the T-gloss (290, 24) *Transtra: tabulae in nave ubi remiges sedent*. But the preceding item, (290, 23) *Trabica; carina tuba (?)*, suggests the *Festus* lemma from which *Paulus* took (504) *Trabica, navis; quod sit trabibus confixa; Pacuvius 'labitur trabica in alveos'*. And the addition of one letter would make 290, 17 (*Taura: sterilis*) identical with *Fest.* 480 (*Taurus vaccas steriles appellari, etc.*). The *Abolita* glosses (290, 27) *Transenna*, (290, 30) *Trabea* have been already mentioned. The concluding portion (not mentioned) of the second in *Cass.* (187, 17a *Dicta autem trabea quod in maiori gloria hominem tra[ns]beat, hoc est in posterum ampliori dignitate et honore beatum faci[a]t*) can, of course, be referred to *Isidore* (Etym. 19, 24, 8) *Trabea autem dicta quod in maiori gloria hominem tra[ns]bearet (v. l. transveheret), hoc est ultra et in posterum ampliori dignitate honoris beatum faceret*. Still *Isidore* may have taken this absurd etymology from *Festus* and have kept *Festus'* own words (as he has done, I think, in Etym. 11, 1, 62 *Ola summi humeri pars posterior*. Cf. C. G. L. IV, p. xviii). Romance students will be interested in a gloss in this section (291, 37) *Testa: vasa fictilia et caput* (French *tête*). The excuse for mentioning it here is that it shews '*vasa fictilia*' to be a current phrase and therefore possibly a mere conjectural emendation by the compiler in a *Festus* gloss, *Capides*, in the C-section, (215, 20) *Candes: vasa fictilia*, of which the *Abolita* form is (28, 2) *Cardens: vasa fretiva (festiva ?)* *Saliorum*. The substitution of n for r suits an archetype in *Insular* half-uncial, and *Candes* is the form in the 'English group' (*Ampl. I, Ampl. II, etc.*). *Festus* is strongly suggested by the neighbour of *Testa*, (291, 38) *Tesqua: deserta, aspera* (cf. *Fest.* 488); also by (291, 50) *Tetini: tenui, habui* (cf. *Paul.* 503 *Tetini pro tenui*) and (293, 5) *T(h)omix: restis leviter torta* (cf. *Fest.* 488 *Thomices Graeco nomine appellantur ex cannabi impolita*

et sparto leviter tortae restes ex quibus funes fiunt; Lucilius, etc.); less strongly by the neighbour of Thomix, (293, 4) Toles membra sunt circa uvam (?? cf. Fest. 490), and by (293, 29) Trossuli: equites Romani cum equis publicis (? cf. Paul. 505); while 294, 1 (Tugurium: hospitium modicum <a> teia?) may be merely a re-casting of the Abstrusa item (187, 19) Tugurium: cellula parva, a tegendo.

In the U-section one claimant, Vola (296, 49; cf. Paul. 511) has been already mentioned. We may add (296, 25) Vitulans: lascivus, gaudens, cum exultatione laetans (cf. Paul. 507); (296, 10) Vinnulus: mollis (cf. Paul. 519); (294, 17) Valvulum (-lus?): fabae corium (cf. Fest. 514 Valvoli fabae folliculi appellati sunt, etc.); (297, 51) Urvum (-us?): quod bubulcus tenet in aratro. The last may have been in Abolita a part (or a neighbour) of 196, 3 Urvus: circuitus civitatis. And both may come from Fest. 514 (Urvat Ennius in Andromeda significat circumdat, ab eo sulco qui fit in urbe condenda urvo aratri, quae fit forma simillima uncini curvatione buris et dentis, cui praefigitur vomer), unless the first is taken from Isidore (Etym. 15, 2, 3 Urbs . . . ab urbo, parte aratri). Isidore borrows from Servius (ad Aen. 1, 12). Finally (296, 40) Vitiligat (-gant): vituperat (-rant). Loewe makes it Vitilitigat (-gant), a Cato gloss.

For A-L Festus is not in evidence. In the A-section of our glossary we find: (202, 11) Avillus (Abellum MSS; cf. the AA Glossary 442, 3 and 10): agnus recens natus (cf. Paul. 13 Avillus: agnus recentis partus): (202, 16) Abiugassere: disiungere ('unyoke'), already mentioned; (202, 35) Apluda (Abunda MSS): panici et millei folliculi (cf. Paul. 10); (202, 20) Aptra: folia vitea (= Philox. 18, 34 Aptra: ἀμπελόφυλλα, ὡς Τιτίνιος); (202, 39) Acieris (Acierlis MSS): securis quam flamines seu pontifices habebant (cf. Paul. 9; possibly taken directly from Philox. 13, 9 A.: ἀξίνη ἱεροφάντων, ὡς Πλαῦτος, so that we need not ascribe 'flam.', 'pont.' to Festus); (204, 21) Aestimiae (Aefumiae in the archetype?): aestimationes (Paul. 24 Aestimias, aestimationes); (205, 28) Allux: pollex in pede (from Philox. 68, 12 Hallus: ποδὸς μέγας δάκτυλος. Cf. Paul. 91 Hallus: pollex pedis, etc. The Latin Thesaurus omits 'pedis'); (206, 6) Alebre: pulchrum, bene educatum (cf. Philox. 14, 35 A.: εὐτροφος. A clearer trace of Festus is in the

First Amplonian Glossary, Alebre: alimentum, while the Second Amplonian Glossary seems to blend Fest. and Philox. in its Alebre: quod bene a quibus alitur); (206, 9) Altiboans: in alto ex alto sonans (of the Philox. type); (206, 8 and 10) Al[ci]tellus: alte evocatus (*leg. educatus*), Altellus: <in> terra nutritus (cf. Paul. 6 Altellus Romulus dicebatur quasi altus in tellure, etc.); (206, 28) A[n]xati: vocati, nominati (the error suggests Philox., although even in Paul. 7 Axare: nominare appears among an-items); (206, 29) A[n]xilites: aves, volucres (from Philox. 21, 37 A[n]xilites: ὄρνιθες, οἰωνοί. Cf. Paul. 3 Alites, among ax-items. The AA Glossary probably retains the Festus gloss of Abol. in its A[n]xilites: aves, auspicium, perhaps a reduction of A[n]xillites: aves auspicium volatu facientes); (207, 48) Ardalio: glutto (perhaps a Martial gloss in Philox.); (208, 11) Arferia (Arseria in the archetype): vas vinarium cum quo vinum ad aras ferebant (Paul. 10 jumbles up *arferial*, -lis 'aqua' and *arferia* 'vas'); (208, 13) Arcera: plaustrum (corrects the error in Paul. 14 Arcirma genus plaustri est, etc.; for we have no reason to suppose that our compiler used ps.-Plac. 7, 2 Arcera: plaustrum, id est carrum); (208, 35) Asparagus, quia virgas habet asperas (? cf. Paul. 18); (209, 27) Aureax: [n]eque<s> solitarius (= Philox. 26, 51 Aureax: solitarius ἰππαστής. Cf. Paul. 8 Aureax, auriga, etc.); (209, 30) Auctoratio: venditio, nam sub auctoratione sunt gladiatores qui se vendunt. Since 203, 1 (Accipitrem: acceptorem) is an Abstrusa gloss (5, 31), it does not concern us. Lucilius (1130 exta acceptoris et unguis) made a purist's mistake in rejecting *accipiter*, the Indoeuropean name for the hawk, 'the quick-flyer' (Greek ὠκυπέτης), an excellent name, as anyone will admit who has watched a hawk chasing a pigeon.

In the B-section we find (212, 38) <Boves lucae:> boves Lucaniae, elephantii (possibly from Philox. Cf. the Cyrillus Glossary's 'Ελέφας: elephantus, bos luca, barrus. Was the phrase mentioned in the Festus lemma from which Paulus took the lemma Barrire? Cf. the Affatim gloss, 489, 28); (213, 3) Bubinare: inquinare sanguine muliebri menstruo (cf. Paul. 29 Bubinare est menstruo mulierum sanguine inquinare; Lucilius, etc.). The second has been ascribed to ps.-Plac. (8, 18). But his lemma is Bubino, and Bubinare is precisely the lemma of Paulus; so this argument for a borrowing from ps.-Plac. by

our compiler lacks force. It is more likely that an *Abolita* gloss omitted in *Vat.* and *Cass.* has been used; or perhaps one omitted by *Cass.* alone, for all this part (*AR-BU*) of *Vat.* has been lost. We have no *Abolita* glosses in *Cass.* like (212, 21-2) *Boa*: *rubor vehemens*, *Boa*: *serpens mirae magnitudinis et tumor in crure suffuso sanguine* (cf. *Paul.* 27 *Bova*). Certainly a lemma of *ps.-Plac.*, (34, 2) *Blattit*: *praecipue loquitur* (*praecupide* l. *Deuerling*), tallies with our gloss (210, 52) *Blattit*: *perstupide* (*leg. praecupide?*) *loquitur*. But our gloss may be an *Abolita* gloss (omitted by *Cass.*) from the *Festus* lemma from which comes *Paulus'* excerpt (30) *Blatterare est stulte et praecupide loqui, quod a Graeco blax originem ducit, etc.*; and so may its two neighbours, (210, 51) *Blax*: *stultus, insipiens* (cf. *Abol.* 25, 65 *Blax*: *stultus*) and (210, 53) *Blapere* (*leg. Blaterare?*): *stupide et sine causa loqui* (cf. *Abol.* 26, 1 *Blaterat*: *stulte loquitur*). Whether the evidence of *Vat.* would have settled our doubts we do not know. We have no reason to ascribe to *Festus* the pair, (210, 10) *Bacerus*: *baro factus*, (210, 25) *Barginae*: *peregrinae* (from *Philox.*). The *Latin Thesaurus* should not assign the quantity *bargīna* to the mnemonic verses in a school-edition of *Caper* (*Gram. Lat.* VII 103, 8), for these verses are probably as much 'syllabic' (with syllable-counting) as quantitative. But 211, 15 (*Buteo*: *aves quae in auspicio servatur*) certainly suggests the *Festus* source of *Paul.* 3, 10 *Alites volatu auspicia facientes istae putabantur, buteo, etc.*

In the C-section: (213, 30) *Campae*: *equi marini* (cf. *Paul.* 38 *Campas, marinos equos, etc.*); (213, 51) *Capite census*: *qui de captivis sub corona vel sub hasta vendebatur*; (214, 1) *Calator*: *minister sacrorum*; (214, 29) *Capidines* (-ped-?), *eo quod manu capiantur* (a gloss which, according to *Hagen Appendix Serviana* p. 480, appears in the *Berne Liber Glossarum* as a *Virgil Gloss*) (cf. *Paul.* 42 *Capis, poculi genus, dictum a capiendo*. The other gloss *Capides* has been mentioned already); (214, 51) *Caculae*: *servi militum* (cf. *Paul.* 39 *Cacula, servus militis*. *Plautus* 'video caculam militarem'. This is a ludicrous curtailment of *Trin.* 721. *Festus'* lemma would quote the full line; also the line of *Accius* quoted by him at 132, 15 and containing *caculae*); (214, 52, a doublet of 219, 37) *Cocula*: *ligna arida vel vasa aerea* (not to be referred to

ps.-Plac. 14, 36 Coculis: aereis vasis ad coquendum vel assulis aridis. Cf. Paul. 34 Cocula: vasa aenea coctionibus apta; alii cocula dicunt ligna minuta quibus facile decoquantur obsonia); (215, 2) Calvitur: fallit (hardly from Philox. 96, 24 Calvitur: *ἰξαναρά*. Rather from the Abolita gloss 27, 53, which is one of a Festus batch, although our Abolita MSS shew 'moratur' only, not 'fallit'); (215, 22) Caperrata: contracta, rugosa (cf. Paul. 41 Caperratum, rugosum, a cornuum caprinorum similitudine dicitur. If our gloss shews the Abl., then Festus quoted the whole of Naevius com. 51, of which we know only two words 'caperrata fronte'; if the Nom., which is less likely, he may have quoted Varro Men. 134 quin mihi caperratam tuam frontem, Strobile, omittis?, or else the Comedian's line which Varro parodies or reproduces. The lost Abolita gloss may have dropped out of our MSS in proximity to 29, 34 Caperratum, a gloss from Apuleius. There is however still another possibility, that our gloss is a Nonius gloss and that the Festus gloss of Abol. is preserved in the Liber Glossarum, Caperratum: erectum, rigidum); (215, 44) Calcitrone: qui infestant calcibus (originally a neighbour of Compernes 220, 51), perhaps an Apuleius gloss of Abol. which has dropped out of Vat. (Cass. n. 1.); (216, 8) Claudier: claudi (perhaps a Terence gloss of Abol., lost in our MSS); (217, 5) Cicuma (Caec- MSS): noctua (cf. Paul. 35 Cicuma avis noctua); (216, 35) Gliscit: crescit (perhaps from the third letter-section of Philox., 34, 19 Gliscit: *αὔξει*. Cf. Paul. 87 Gliscere crescere est, etc. But it may be merely the Abstrusa gloss of 83, 10); (217, 23) Ciccum: cortex mali granati (from Philox. probably rather than from ps.-Plac. 13, 23 Ciccum: granum mali Punici aut umbilicus lupini. But Festus is suggested by the First Amplonian gloss, tenuis pellis inter grana; cf. Paul. 37 Ciccum, membrana tenuis malorum Punicorum. The word is used by Aldhelm laud. virgin. 9, carm. virgin. 236 and 1596); (220, 51) Compernes (-is?): <femoribus compressis?> (perhaps from Philox. 110, 55 Compernis: *σύνμηρος*. Cf. Paul. 35); (220, 52=42) Comesatio: comestio (probably, with no. 50 Comessat: manducat, like no. 53 Comissatur, an Abstrusa gloss; cf. 41, 30. If so, not to be connected with Paul. 36); (222, 28) Collibescit: complacet, delectatur; (223, 5) Conierat: simul cum ceteris iurat (cf. the Abavus Glossary Conierat: coniurat).

It is probably too fanciful to connect a curious item, (224, 27) Cortina: responsum, with Paul. 21, 1 (Aperta idem Apollo vocabatur quia patente *cortina responsa* ab eo dentur) rather than to see in it a (lost Abolita) Virgil gloss on Aen. 6, 347 neque te Phoebi cortina fefellit. A curious explanation stands in (213, 35) Camuri boves (Camuribus MSS): brevibus cornibus. The mistake would be intelligible if this item came from the Festus lemma Patulum bovem (cf. Paul. 246 cuius cornua diversa sunt ac late patent). The f for v in (214, 31) Carissa: vafra (fabā MSS; scarcely for 'favea') is a Spanish spelling, a relic of the Spanish Abolita archetype; but our Abolita MSS offer (28, 3) Carissa lena est dupla (cf. Paul. 38 Carissam apud Lucilium vafrum significat). While Paulus has merely Cerritus: furiosus (47), our glossary offers (217, 40) Cerritus: subinsanus ex commotione cerebri (a Festus gloss?). Festus is suggested by the trio: (218, 20-22) Creperae: in corpore dubitare (?), Crepusculum: finem noctis et initium diei, Creperum: dubium (cf. Paul. 46 Creperum: dubium, etc.; 62 Decreptus est desperatus crepera iam vita, ut crepusculum extremum diei tempus, etc.), but the second resembles an Abstrusa gloss (33, 31) and the only Abolita gloss in our MSS offers (33, 9) Creperis: dubiis. The Second Amplonian Glossary has (along with the first of our trio) Creperae: asperae vel dubiae, Creperae: dubiae, incertae (cf. ps.-Plac. 13, 27), Crepusculum: tempus intra finem noctis et initium diei; antiqui enim creperum dubium vocabant, inde et ipsum tempus crepusculum vocabant in quo dubitatur utrum dies adhuc sit an nox. Thurneysen (in the Latin Thesaurus) is wisely suspicious of (220, 15) Columis (-es): salvus (-os). It may be one of the 'ghost-words' that flit about glossaries, for the in-symbol was often hardly distinguishable from that of 'id est' and 'columis' would easily emerge as a new lemma from (let us say) Reduces: salvos, id est columes (*leg. incolumes*) reversos. (Cf. also Columen and Culmen.) A 'ghost-word' with which all readers of glossaries are familiar occurs in this section (213, 23) Caplosus: illisus. It is the phantom offspring of the miswriting of cōplosus (i. e. complosus or, if the archetype was a Spanish MS, conplosus) in the Abstrusa archetype, and the phrase referred to was 'complosis manibus' or the like. Unless we can credit our compiler with the emendation, the mistake

must have been corrected in the archetype, for we find in our MS the correct form also (220, 33) *Complosus: illisus*. One more gloss in the C-section demands mention, (223, 31) *Combib[i]ones a bibendo dicti* (cf. Nonius 38, 11 *Conbibones, conpotores, a bibendo dicti*).

In the D-section: (225, 2) *Danista: fenerator* (? cf. Paul. 60 *Danistae, feneratores*); (225, 7) *Dapsilis: largus dapibus*; (225, 25) *Delicat: probat*; (226, 23) *Depeculato (-tus?)*: de furto publico, seu depraedato (-tus?) (cf. Abstr. 50, 11); (226, 36) *Deglubere: vellicare*; (226, 40) *Detrectat: valde tractat, contemnit*; (230, 34-35) *Duellibus: adversariis, Duellum: bellum duorum hominum* (cf. Paul. 58 *Duellum, bellum, videlicet quod duabus partibus de victoria contendentibus dimicatur*; inde et perduellio, qui pertinaciter retinet bellum. The AA Glossary, which drew from a good MS of Abol., has *Duellum: duorum hominum bellum*). In the E-section (232, 7) *Ensito* has no claim to be early Latin: it is merely the clumsy St. Gall spelling of *Insitum*. Indeed the scribe probably ought to have written *Insitam*, for that is the form of the *Abstrusa* gloss (98, 17) in our MSS. *Extimus* too (234, 11) is probably an *Abstrusa* gloss (71, 5); and even *Examussim* (234, 5; cf. 70, 4). More worthy of mention are: (235, 61) *Exanclare: exhaurire* (cf. Paul. 70 *Exanclare, exhaurire*); (235, 8) *Exhaustant: exhauriunt*; (236, 4) *Exlex: extra legem*. Also (233, 41) *Evelatus: spoliatus* (hardly identical with Abstr. 71, 14 *Exvolutus* or *Exvolatus*) and (233, 38) *Evelantur: spoliantur* (?? cf. Cyrill. 237, 13 *Ἀποκαλύπτω: evelo, detego*); for Paul. (68) has a lemma *Evelatum*.

In the F-section (236, 51) *Falarica: lancea magna vel genus teli magni* (probably the Abol. item, whereas the Abstr. item is that mentioned in its various forms at the beginning of this paper) is rather a Virgil gloss (on Aen. 9, 705) than a Festus gloss. Philologists have welcomed (240, 21) *Fuma: terra*. It is precisely what the Fem. O-stem *humus* of Latium might be expected to become in other dialects (cf. *foetis* for *hostis*, etc.); and dialectal words are often treated by Festus. Still it may be a mere 'ghost-word', evoked (let us suppose) from a Virgil gloss (on Aen. 4, 24) <Ima tellus:> *infuma (-ima) terra*. The Plautine (?) interjection of 240, 2 (*Fufae: interiectio mali odoris*) is quite the combination of sounds by which

we express the same disgust. If our glossary was a Bobbio compilation, this item may have come from the famous Bobbio MS of Charisius. But it may also be a Festus gloss (cf. Plautus Cas. 727, where the palimpsest may have read *foe foe* (*fufoe*?) and the Palatine archetype *fy fy*. In Asin. 894 not merely our MSS of Plautus but our MSS of Nonius read *tuae*). *Fratratria* (239, 6) is an Abstrusa gloss (80, 33).

In the G-section we must emend (241, 22) *Gentiunt anseres* (*leg.* *Gingriunt*), for it is precisely Philox. 33, 55 *Gingriunt*: *χῆνες ἐκβοῶσιν* (cf. Paul. 84 *Gingrire anserum vocis proprium est*; unde genus quoddam tibiaram exiguarum *gingrinae*); although 'gentiunt' may not be a mere slip of the pen (cf. vulgar Lat. *ganta* 'goose'). There is some suggestion of Paul. 83 (*Genialis lectus*) in 241, 23 *Genialis lectus*: *qui in nuptiis sternitur*; of Paul. 83 (*Genas*) in 241, 34 *Genae*: *mala<e> quae in facie <sunt>*, *id est sub oculis* (cf. Philox. ?); of Paul. 87 (*Glos*) in 242, 36 *Glos*: *viri soror*.

In the I-section 251, 3 (*Insimulat*: *accusat, fingit*) seems to be a Terence gloss of *Abolita* (98, 3) and 252, 12 (*Investis*: *sine barba*) an Apuleius gloss of *Abolita* (90, 5). Noteworthy are (247, 13) *In procinctu*: *in expeditione*, (251, 12) *Interpola*: *reprobata*. In the L-section 253, 13 (*Lapidina*) is an Abstrusa item (105, 1) and not to be connected with Paul. 105, while 253, 28 *Lactasis*: *metaphora ab infantibus* (*leg.* *Lactasses*?) may be a Terence gloss of *Abolita* which has dropped out of our MSS. Festus however is suggested by (254, 5) *Lapit*: *cruciat, sollicitat, dolet* (cf. Paul. 105 *Lapit, dolore afficit*); (255, 14) *Lingula* (*leg.* *Lingulaca*?): *arguta* (-tus), *loquax* (? cf. Paul. 104). The (erroneous) theory that one source of our glossary was ps.-Plac. (and Plac.) finds a modicum of support in (253, 27) *Lampenae*: *stellae fulgentes*. For Plac. (30, 28) offers *Lampenae*: *stellae quidem sic dictae*. And although absent from our MSS of ps.-Plac., the word appears in that Anthology preface which is a mosaic of ps.-Plac. curios. On the other hand our item is quite of the Philox. type. (Notice that 289, 22 *Suppremi* comes, not directly from Plac., but from Isidore Diff. 511.) We must not connect with Festus (Paul. 103) the item (255, 22) *Limis*: *strabo et obliqu<i>s oculis*. It comes from Philox. 123, 28 *Limis oculis*: *obliquis* (*v. l. L. obl. oc.*), where it is perhaps a Horace gloss (on

Sat. 2, 5, 53 sic tamen ut limis rapias, etc.) ; or, less probably, from Abol. 108, 35 Limis oculis: oblique intuentibus, where it is rather a Terence gloss (on Eun. 601 ego limis specto). In either case it is a confusion of *limis* (sc. oculis) with a Nom. Sing. *limis*. Finally may be mentioned (256, 15) Luculleum: genus marmoris albi, (256, 20) Lupercalia: gentium cultura, id est sacra Panis, quia ipse dicitur dedisse responsa ut coirent lupi et hirci. The second may be an Abstrusa gloss (on Virgil Aen. 8, 343 or 663?) ; for Sangall. has filaments that touch the 'English group' of glossaries, a group which seems to have drawn on a fuller version of Abstrusa, containing many long Virgil glosses (apparently culled from valuable 'variorum' scholia).

We end our review of the Festus (or Early Latin) glosses without having found reason to abandon the theory adopted at the beginning, that the two sources of Festus glosses in Sangall. are (1) the Abolita Glossary, (2) the Philoxenus Glossary. It is true that many Sangall. items of this kind do not appear in our extant MSS of Abol. and Philox. But it is more likely that these MSS have omitted a certain number of items than that there existed some imaginary third glossary which, like Abol. and Philox., drew materials directly from Festus. We have no reason to suppose that either Vat. (with Cass.) or the 9th century Philoxenus archetype MS exhibit a perfectly complete text. Our glossary, rightly regarded, provides the means of supplying some of their omissions.

Since it has been shewn to take its Festus glosses from these two sources, and not directly from a text (or epitome) of Festus, Goetz' suggestion (Berl. Phil. Woch. of 1914, p. 874) that Paulus may have used an already existing epitome loses probability.

W. M. LINDSAY.

THE UNIVERSITY, ST. ANDREWS, SCOTLAND.

II.—VEDIOVIS, THE VOLCANIC GOD.

A RECONSTRUCTION.

In the interesting summary of the geological evolution of the Roman province in Abbate, Guida della prov. di Roma, pp. 74-175, a description is given of the Volsinian, Ciminian, Sabatine, Latin, Hernician and other volcanic craters of the province. Soracte was the first mountain to emerge and is non-volcanic. Then came the limestone subsidiary ranges, the Praenestini, Lepini, Simbruini, Sabini. Another upheaval brought up the main Apennine ossature linked with the above mainly by the hills of Frusino, Ferentinum and Anagnia. With the Quaternary period came the emergence of the sub-soil of the Roman Campagna and its hills after sub-aqueous volcanic convulsions. The great aerial volcanic eruptions that followed began apparently in the Hernician hills and then concentrated at the Alban crater and were accompanied by great diluvial action. Even before the subsidence of these violent conditions at the close of the Quaternary period, the presence of man on the mountains is proved. Soon after, man came down to the region of the Alban hills and the new coast line, but the active action of the Alban crater did not cease until some time after all other craters north of Campania had become extinct and the only signs of the tremendous activity in the region of Viterbo were its mineral springs such as the famous sulphur pond of *Bulicame*.

It is generally conceded that the primitive Romans, as well as their ancestors and other Italic tribes worshipped deities that embodied the important functions and operations of nature, of which man had either hopes or fears. These deities were not anthropomorphic and anecdotic, like Greek deities, but rather the impersonal essences of these natural forces. It would therefore have been extraordinary if there had not been, among these functional impersonations, a representative of volcanic action in its various forms.

Even a superficial student of the geological history of Rome and Latium is aware of the important rôle that must

have been played by volcanic action during the formative stage of this religion especially at and near Alba, the mother-city of Rome.¹ At that period it was certainly the most violent, obvious and destructive of the natural forces against which the people sought to protect themselves by their more or less magic ritual. Not only was a large part of the Latin territory subject to the effects of the eruptions of the Alban crater, but the volcanic formation on which the people lived still teemed,² even in historic times, with hot springs like the Lautolae in the Forum, or with crevasses like the Tarentum in the Campus, or the Curtian lake (Livy, VII 6, 1), all of which were as much due to the latent activity of the volcanic god as the ashes, lava or lapilli were due to his virulent action, of which Livy still chronicles a number of instances until quite a late period.³ Even the unusual eruption of the Alban crater to which the formation of Monte Cavo was due, when the stream of lava is supposed to have flowed quite a distance toward Rome, seems to have taken place after the founding of the earliest settlements on the Roman hills because the cinerary urns of the Alban necropolis found under the lava belong roughly to the same archaeological period as the tombs in the early necropolis of the Roman forum.⁴

¹ The volcanic region is summarized by Pais (*Stor. crit. di Roma* I 701): "la vasta plaga che dall' Amiata si stende ai monti di Bolsena, al Cimino, ai colli Albani, alla montagna di Rocca Monfina e in fine al Vesuvio".

² Pais (*loc. cit.*) has an inkling of the truth when, after saying that the great volcanic eruptions had long ceased when the first settlements were founded, he says that their influence remained and that the sulphurous and mephitic emanations of the volcanic area and the numerous thermal springs existing from Viterbo to Rome determined certain fearsome religious rites like that of Soranus, worshipped by the Hirpini on Mt. Soracte, and perhaps also that of Vediovis among the Latins. My paper was written, in its present form, as long ago as December, 1912, and I did not see this suggestion of Pais until July, 1913. In any case Pais did not follow up his suggestion. On the contrary, he states that he accepts the Wissowa theory (p. 701), while elsewhere he actually adopts Preller's asylum theory (I 588).

³ Livy, I 31. 2; VII 28. 7; cf. III 10; XXI 62. 5; XXIII 31. 15; XXV 77; XXVI 23; XXXV 9; etc.

⁴ For a bibliography of the necropolis consult Kiepert-Hülsem, *Formae Urbis*. See esp. Not. Scavi, Bull. Com. and Röm. Mittheil. for 1902 and 1903, etc.

We should, then, expect to find among the original *di indigetes* of Rome, among the *di inferi*, a volcanic god: but we do not find such a god. At least, he has not been identified. We need not discuss the philologically tempting Vulcanus. With the Etruscans he was one of the Thunder-and-Lightning-gods. He was among the *di indigetes* of Rome and had his special flamen, and he represented the element of fire. But it was the fire kindled above the earth's surface. He was invoked against incendiary fires; was, in later times, the god of firemen. He was, for instance, worshipped at Perugia after the partial burning of the city by the army of the young Augustus on its capture in the civil war of 41 B. C. His cult was given particular prominence at Ostia where protection of the warehouses against fire was all-important. Vulcanus was, in fact, a sort of personified Fire Insurance Company to whom the Romans paid regular dues. But, he had nothing to do with elemental subterranean fires.

Yet, the real volcanic god has, during all these centuries, been at our hand, waiting to be recognized, his real character forgotten ever since the time when the cessation of any reminiscent fear of danger from volcanic action combined with the growth of scepticism had made the Romans of the late Republic forget his real character, though, with their usual tenacity, they held on to the husk of his cult.

The name of this god is Vediovis. It is variously spelled Vediovis, Veiovis or Veditus. When the Roman antiquarians of the age of Cicero and Augustus began to study the past, his origin and characteristics had been so completely befogged that they and their successors have told us practically nothing about him. Modern critics confess themselves puzzled or quite thwarted. Preller's old conjecture (I 262) that Vediovis was the patron god of criminals, based on the position of one of his temples *inter duos lucos* on the Capitol, where legend placed the primitive Asylum for criminals, is too fantastic to be seriously considered. Fowler¹ says: "We have but his name to go upon, and two or three "indistinct traces of his cult", and he adds that he must "give up the attempt to discover the original nature of this god". Wissowa,² who shares with Mr. Fowler the primacy in matters of

¹ Roman Festivals, p. 121.

² Religion u. Kultus d. Römer², p. 236 sqq.

Roman religion, is a little more definite. He believes that we can at least assert two things of Vediovis: (1) that he was an infernal deity and (2) that he was, as his name indicates, the counterpart or opposite of Jupiter. He supports this with the early Roman formula of *devotio* or ritual sacrifice *pro bono publico* cited by Macrobius, in which Vediovis is associated with the spirits of the dead, the *di manes*, in much the same way that Jupiter is associated with the guardians of the living, the *di penates*. He adds the evidence of late writers who connect or identify Vediovis with Dis Pater and Pluto and make him lord of the underworld at a time previous to the complete dominance of Hellenic ideas. Another suggestion has been contributed by the historian of ancient divination, Bouché-Leclercq.¹ Referring to the table of gods distributed in the sixteen sections of the heavenly templum in the chart of Martianus Capella, according to the system of Etruscan divination by thunder and lightning, he points to the fact that the name of Vediovis appears in the fifteenth of these sections of the heavens and that he must therefore have some connection with thunder and lightning, though he is puzzled to see how this is possible.

A few Roman writers had also indulged in conjectures. Ovid² and Festus³ introduced a needlessly confusing element. They interpreted Vediovis to be the Youth-Jupiter, very much as the god of the shrine at Anxur was the Child-Jupiter. This was based merely on the diminutive aspect of the prefix particle *ve*: thus VE(D)iovis = Little Jupiter. This conjecture has been very properly relegated to the waste-paper basket. The two other meanings of the prefix *ve* have also been used as a basis of interpretations: the privative and the excessive or malignant and unregulated. The theory of Gellius⁴ was that the force of *ve* was privative; and that there was in Vediovis the absence of all the positive excellencies of Jove. But Fowler is undoubtedly right in saying that we cannot evolve out of Jupiter merely by subtraction any distinct deity who should be a sinister opposite to Jupiter.

¹ Histoire de la divination antique, IV p. 36.

² Fasti, III 437-448.

³ Paulus, p. 379.

⁴ N. A. V 12.

Therefore, in looking to the name as an index of character it would seem as if we must turn to the third idea inherent in the *ve*, the idea of unbridled violence, of undisciplined force, such as is exemplified in *vesanus* as opposed to *sanus*.

Whatever relation there was to Jupiter must therefore have involved not primitive identity but primitive distinction and opposition, though on the same plane. As Diovis ruled heaven, so Vediovis may have ruled a not-heaven. As Diovis personified order and judgment, so Vediovis may have personified disorder and dementia. As Diovis caused and ruled the heavenly thunder and lightning, so Vediovis caused the subterranean thunder and lightning. We will see later how much corroboration there is for this interpretation.

Aside from these conjectures of Ovid, Festus and Gellius, based on the name alone, what are the stray hints that have reached us from Roman times and that must be the basis of any interpretation?

(1) Inscription of the late Republic of the Gens Iulia at Bovillae on altar to Vediovis.

(2) Mention in the primitive calendar of an agonium, apparently in honor of Vediovis.

(3) Varro's statement that Vediovis was a Sabine god introduced into primitive Rome.

(4) Early formula of *devotio* associating Vediovis with the *di manes*: and reference to ancient rituals with mention of Vediovis in Gellius.

(5) Mention of two temples of Vediovis in Rome and appearance of his name three times in the calendar.

(6) Appearance of Vediovis among the gods in the Etruscan scheme for divination by thunder and lightning as given by Martianus Capella.

(7) Description of a statue of Vediovis in his Capitoline temple in Ovid and Gellius.

(8) Sacrifice of a goat to Vediovis, *ritu humano*, reported by Gellius.

(9) Reference to the *Fulmen Veiovis*(?) in Ammianus Marcellinus.

(10) Connection between Dis Pater and Vediovis in Martianus Capella.

(11) Connection between Apollo and Vediovis in Gellius.

I will now analyze this material, beginning with the inscription at Bovillae, which is the only record of Vediovis that has been found outside of Rome and the only inscription to him.

This inscription was on an altar found at Bovillae. Gell¹ gives a drawing of the altar and describes it as of rough peperino and says that it 'has since perished'. Its lines, with the pinched neck above the base are quite early. They are almost exactly paralleled at the latest in an altar of the year 9 B. C. with archaic outlines now in the museum of the Antiquarium Comunale at Rome, illustrated by Pais;² by a still earlier one dedicated 151 B. C. to the god Verminus, in the same museum; and, much earlier by the tufa altar of the Black Stone which is usually ascribed to the fifth century B. C. or earlier. It was evidently the usual form down to the close of the Republic. The inscription CIL. I 807 reads, in two sections:

VEDIOVEI PATREI GENTEILES IVLIEI
VED[IOVEI IV]L[E]I[A]ARA LEEGE ALBANA DICATA

The altar was dedicated by the Iulian Gens, and the inscription seems to be the only known dedication to Vediovis. Its early date, perhaps the second century B. C., and its context, give it greater value as a document than anything else, not even excepting the testimony of the calendar and the description of the statue. The three cardinal points are: the name *Pater* given to Vediovis; the fact that the altar was dedicated according to a certain special ritual, the *lex Albana*; and thirdly the bearing of the site itself where the altar was found upon the character of the god.

The qualification of the god as *Vediovis Pater* is indicative of two things: of the primitive and also of the important character of his cult. Mars Pater, Janus Pater, Quirinus Pater, Saturnus Pater, Liber Pater, Neptunus Pater, Terra Mater, Mater Matuta, Dis Pater are other deities to receive this sort of surname and they belong to the foremost and earliest of the Roman gods. Also this is one of a very small class of inscriptions in which a Roman gens declares its adoption of a patron god.

¹ Topography of Rome, etc., p. 123.

² Ancient legends, p. 166: cf. Helbig, Führer¹ I pp. 595-596.

The second point, the use of the Lex Albana in the dedication of the *ara*, is not only a most unusual circumstance, but one which in this case is fundamental. It indicates that the cult of Vediovis was centered at and derived from Alba, and that the regulations that governed it were formulated in a specific Alban ritual. It will be evident why this was so as soon as we admit the volcanic connection of Vediovis. Let this be admitted before it is proved, for the sake of argument. Given the fact that the Alban crater was the centre of volcanic action in this region previous to the iron age; given also the fact that around it has been found archaeological material that connects the Albans with the prehistoric *terramare* and that is earlier than any yet found in this part of Italy,¹ it follows that the cult of the volcanic god would naturally originate and centre at Alba.

Further, as Bovillae was only about three miles distant and so was directly within the danger zone, an altar to a volcanic god would be particularly appropriate here. It would also be natural that the volcanic cult should linger here at its centre long after it had lost all significance in Rome itself.

The presence of Vediovis on the calendar² is important, but rather difficult to use in any definite manner except as showing the primitive character of the cult and its place in the festivals of the whole people. The primitive calendar of Numa contains the mention of an *agonium* on May 21, a date connected with Vediovis. There seems no absolute certainty as to the original nature of an *agonium* except that it was a festival of the whole people and of the most primitive period, with which the earliest of the priestly authorities, the *rex sacrorum*, was connected. The juxtaposition of the *agonium* of May 21 with Vediovis is a further indication that his cult antedated the Republic and that he ranks with the *di indigetes*. Two other calendar days are marked as his festivals in later redactions of the calendar, each of them in connection with

¹ See, for a good summary of this question, Modestov, *Introd. à l'histoire romaine*, passim. Important material bearing on this connection and but little known existed in the Museo Kircheriano at Rome, and has recently been, I believe, moved to the Etruscan Museum at Villa Giulia.

² Fowler, *Roman Festivals*, 121-122, 277-278. Wissowa, loc. cit.

one of his two temples. On March 7 there was a ceremony at his temple on the Capitol *inter duos lucos*; and on January 1 was the anniversary celebration of the dedication of his temple on the Island.

Is it allowable to infer that the existence of two temples was made necessary by the change in the pomerium? The primitive shrine of the god *inter duos lucos* was originally, according to a theory with which I heartily agree, outside the pomerium, as we should naturally expect in the case of one of the *di inferi*. Fowler regards the sign of the god Terminus that was the only emblem not removed from the lower spur of the Capitol to make way for Jupiter O. M., to have been the stone that marked the pomerium of the primitive Quirinal city on that side.¹ At all events this part of the Capitol hill, including the depression between the two peaks, remained outside the *urbs* of the Four Regions, and consequently outside the early pomeria—supposing that there were pre-Servian pomeria. Are we to infer that when the pomerium was enlarged so as to include the Capitol it became impossible to perform the ritual of Vediovis in the Capitoline temple and that it was necessary to build a second temple on the Island outside the new pomerium? In this case the older temple would have been retained as a sacred place, as in other cases, but the real activities of the cult would have been transferred to the Island. Against this is the apparent contemporaneity of the two temples: we should have to suppose that L. Furius Purpureo who vowed the temple on the Island in 200 B. C. began it in 196 and dedicated it in 194, and who is said also to have built, a few years later, in 192, the temple on the Capitol,² was, in the latter case merely doing a work of reconstruction, as we may infer not only from Ovid but from a passage in Dionysius.³

¹ Roman Festivals, 326-7; cf. 230.

² The passages in Livy relating to the construction of these temples are corrupt and the name of Vediovis has been restored in both cases. The Island temple is referred to in XXXI 21. 12, and the Capitol temple in XXXV 41. 8.

³ Dionysius of Halicarnassus II 15 (cf. II 10, 3) in describing the founding of Rome speaks of the temple in the asylum as having been consecrated by Romulus and says that he cannot say to what god or genius it was dedicated.

The only hints as to the character of this cult are given in the passages that refer to the cult-statue of Vediovis in his temple on the Capitol, evidently of early character. Of it Pliny says (N. H. XVI, 216): Have we not the statue of Vediovis, made of cypress wood, still preserved in the Capitol, ever since its dedication in the year 561 of the city?¹ Ovid makes him beardless and Gellius presupposes this in comparing him with Apollo. Gellius speaks of the arrows which he holds, and Ovid calls attention to the fact that he does not hold a thunderbolt. Both writers tell us that the statue was accompanied by a goat.² Gellius adds that it was the custom

¹ Nonne simulacrum Veiovis in arce e cypresso durat a condita urbe DLXI dicatum? The numbers are uncertain and the DCXI of the MS has been amended to DLXI or DLX.

² The full texts of Ovid and Gellius may be quoted here:

Ovid, *Fasti* III 429: Una nota est Marti nonis sacrata quod illis
Templa putant lucos Vediovis ante duos
Romulus ut saxo lucum circumdedit alto,

435: Ne tamen ignaro novitas tibi nominis obstat
Disce, quis iste deus, curve vocetur ita.
Iuppiter est iuvenis. iuvenalis aspice voltus:
Aspice deinde, manu fulmina nulla tenet.
Fulmina post ausos caelum adfectare Gigantes

440: Sumpta Iovi. primo tempore inermis erat.

Stat quoque capra simul. nymphae pavisae feruntur

Cretides, infanti lac dedit illa Iovi.

445: Nunc vocor ad nomen. vegrandia farra colonae
Quae male creverunt, vescaeque parva vocant.
Vis ea si verbi est, cur non ego Vediovis aedem
Aedem non magni suspicer esse Iovis?

The passage in Gellius N. A. V, 12 begins by an interesting reference to early rituals with prayers to Vediovis: "In antiquis precationibus nomina haec deorum inesse animadvertimus; 'Diovis' et 'Vediovis': est autem etiam aedes Vediovis Romae inter arcem et Capitolium 'Iovem' Latini veteres a 'iuvando' appellavere . . . cum Iovem igitur et Diovem a iuvando nominassent, eum contra deum qui non iuvandi potestatem sed vim nocendi haberet . . . Vediovem appellaverunt, dempta atque detracta iuvandi facultate. 'Ve' enim particula . . duplicem significatum . . capit. Nam et augendae rei et minuendae valet . . . Simulacrum igitur dei Vediovis, quod est in aede de qua supra dixi, sagittas tenet, quae sunt videlicet partae ad nocendum. Quapropter

to sacrifice to Vediovis a goat according to a special ritual: *immolaturque ritu humano capra*.

For Ovid it was the goat Amalthea that fitted with his explanation of Vediovis as the boy-Jupiter. It is to be noticed that Ovid presupposes on the part of his readers absolute ignorance as to Vediovis and that even the name will be strange to them (*novitas nominis*). This agrees with the agnostic attitude of Dionysius of Halicarnassus already noted. It agrees also with the fact that Gellius says that Vediovis was quite commonly confused with Apollo because of the arrows in his hand. But it should be noticed that no bow is mentioned, and, as will appear later, the arrows are the symbols of the straight volcanic bolts—the subterranean lightnings. They are contrasted with the forked bolts of the sky lightnings of Jove. The assimilation to Apollo would be, of course, entirely to the destructive element of Apollo.

The connection of the goat with Vediovis is characteristic. It is well known that Greco-Roman mythology and ritual associated the goat with the underworld, especially with elemental heat. Wissowa has called attention to the perfectly logical *taboo* placed on the goat for the Flamen Dialis. Among the things that this priest of Jupiter was forbidden to touch beside a dog, raw meat, beans, ivy, wheat and leavened bread was a goat.¹ This appears only another indication that

eum deum plerumque Apollinem esse dixerunt; immolaturque ritu humano capra eiusque animalis figmentum iuxta simulacrum stat."

Wissowa (p. 296) speaks of the statue as holding *bow* and arrows, but there is no warrant for this in Gellius. The absence of any mention of a bow, both in Gellius and Ovid, favors the interpretation of the arrows as straight thunderbolts.

A coin of the gens Fonteia is considered by Babelon (*Monn. de la republ.* I 506 f.) as representing Vediovis; and there is a considerable group of republican family coins and bronze statuettes which represent a youthful beardless thunder-god. Thulin regards him as an Etruscan form of Jupiter, excluding in every case the ascription to Vediovis. What the young god is holding on these coins can readily be thought a straight thunderbolt such as the Etruscans considered the thunderbolt of Vediovis to be as we shall see. These coins will be referred to later.

¹Gellius X 15, 12; Plut. *Quaest. Rom.* III; cf. Fowler, *Religious Experiences of the Roman people*, p. 34, and Frazer, *Golden Bough*, I 241.

Jupiter and Vediovis and their cults were, so to speak, mutually exclusive.

The use of the Human Rite in connection with the sacrifice of the goat is interpreted by Wissowa (pp. 237-8) to refer not to an original human sacrifice for which a goat was substituted, but to a service for the dead.¹ It will appear later that while this is true, the peculiar function of Vediovis in later times of permitting souls to escape to life among the stars, places the act in the later historic period in a sort of intermediate position, partaking of both ideas. For, of course, the sacrifice *ritu humano* brought the animal so sacrificed into the category of *hostiae animales* or vicarious sacrifices in which the life only and not the body was dedicated to the god. It was said to be a doctrine of the *Disciplina Etrusca* that through this kind of sacrifice² souls could be in each case set free from the infernal regions and transformed into spirits and genii, that is into *di animales*. This appears to have been described in the *Libri Acheruntici*, which formed the last section of the *Disciplina Etrusca*³ and treated of life beyond the grave. In its earliest form, even, this connection of Vediovis with souls and the infernal regions cannot antedate the time of Etruscan influence and must be eliminated from any consideration of Vediovis as a Latin deity. If the goat was originally connected with him the association must then have been due to the idea of heat and fire.

Little attention seems to have been paid to the passage of Varro which makes of Vediovis a primitive Sabine god introduced into Rome at the beginning by Titus Tatius. Varro (LL. V 74) quotes from the *Annals* a list of the Sabine gods worshipped in primitive Rome: *arae Sabinum linguam olent; quae Tati regis voto sunt Romae dedicatae; nam, ut annales dicunt, vovit Opi, Florae, Vediovi, Saturnoque, Soli, Lunae, Vulcano et Summano, itemque Larundae, Termino, Quirino,*

¹ The analogy which he finds to the cult of Soranus on Mt. Soracte is valuable and confirms my volcanic connection, for there was undoubtedly a volcanic legend of primitive character connected with Soracte, even though the mountain itself was non-volcanic.

² Arnobius, II 62: *neque quod Etruria libris in Acheronticis pollicetur, certorum animalium sanguine numinibus certis dato divinas animas fieri et ab legibus mortalitatis educi.*

³ Thulin, *Die etruskische Disciplin*: cf. Serv. Aen. VIII 398.

Vortumno, Laribus, Dianae Lucinaeque. The source for such a list is probably not earlier than the third century B. C., and while of no particular value in proving a Sabine origin is an interesting confirmation of the primitive character of the god.

The association with the *di manes* is quite early. It appears in the formula of *devotio* already referred to. The usual formula of the early type seems to have been the offering of one's life on behalf of the Roman people to *Tellus* or *Terra Mater* and the *di manes*. This is the formula in Livy. But in another formula of less early origin, perhaps, a male chthonic deity is substituted for *Tellus* by the side of the *di manes*. This would seem to have been at first *Vediovis*. Then, with the introduction of Hellenic ideas, *Dis Pater* was added and the formula in Macrobius (III 9, 10) is *Dis Pater, Veiovis* and the *Manes*, which was the formula used by the Roman commander at the Siege of Carthage, showing the stage reached in the course of the second century B. C. It is probable that shortly after this *Vediovis* disappeared from the formulas, especially as *Pluto* was brought in on the Hellenistic wave to reinforce the Greek conceptions of the underworld.

Long after *Vediovis* had disappeared from the horizon of active Roman cults, at some time in fact under the empire, there came an archaistic revival of his cult, or rather of his personality, which finds expression in such writers as Ammianus Marcellinus and Martianus Capella. Such a recrudescence of an entirely obsolete divinity would be unintelligible and of no significance if it were not due to a certain particular cause. It is a peculiar fact, the importance of which has been well demonstrated by Thulin, that it was not until almost imperial times that the books forming the *Disciplina Etrusca* were translated into Latin and so made available beyond the small circle who knew the Etruscan language. The comparatively early Etruscan cycle of religious works with their ritual and divination formulas, handed down from a period hardly later than the sixth century B. C., were appropriated by late Roman writers in very much the same way as sculptors of the age of Augustus or Hadrian reproduced archaic works of Greek sculpture of the sixth and fifth centuries B. C. These Roman echoes of Etruria are all that we have; and while they are in form quite late, it is a fact that the hyper-idealism

of the Neo-Platonic, Gnostic and Mithraic age was far more in sympathy with the pan-naturalism of primitive thought than Roman thought had been at any time between the Punic wars and the age of the Antonines. The writers of the fourth century A. D. were, therefore, in a far better condition to understand the meaning of Vediovis than the writers of the Augustan age. It is in the two authors just mentioned that I find the clearest evidence of the volcanic character of Vediovis.

It is recognized that the Roman historian of the time of the Emperors Constantius and Julian, Ammianus Marcellinus, was a student of the Etrusca Disciplina in its Latin dress. He not only says so himself but proves it by giving a synopsis of some of its doctrines. Now, in describing the vicissitudes of an expedition sent from Gaul by Julian against Constantius in the East, under the command of Severus, his *magister equitum*, the historian speaks of a curious psychological phenomenon which he thinks could hardly be explained on natural grounds. This Severus, who had hitherto been a bold and active leader, turned suddenly timorous and supine (XVII 10, 2): "mortem fortasse metuens adventantem, ut in Tageticis libris legitur Veiovis fulmine mox tangendos adeo hebetari ut nec tonitrum nec maiores aliquos possint audire fragores". This fear of death connected with sudden deafness which afflicted those who were destined to be destroyed by an earthquake or eruption, or, as he puts it, by the *fulmen Veiovis*, which suddenly developed in Severus, is explained if one turns back a couple of pages in the text of Ammianus, and reads the excursus on the subject of earthquakes in which he indulges. Just at this time there were taking place terrible earthquakes over a wide area in Macedonia, Asia and Pontus. Many cities were ruined, and the detailed description which he gives of the destruction of Nicomedia (XVII 7, 1) has remained famous, to be placed beside Pliny's description of the destruction of Pompeii.¹

This leads Ammianus Marcellinus to refer to the ritual and pontifical books and to the ceremonies prescribed in them in connection with and for protection against such calamities. Among these ancient manuals were the Libri Tagetici of the Disciplina Etrusca, which he had consulted. Doubtless it was

¹ Cf. Ammian. Marc. XXXIII 5, 10.

in them that he found deafness and hebetude as symptoms of those destined to be struck by the *fulmen Veiovis*. It was not in a Roman source, for as we have seen the Romans had forgotten, five centuries before, their national beliefs of this sort and in this connection it is interesting to quote a passage of Varro (ap. Gell. II 28): *Quoniam et qua vi et per quem deorum dearumque terra tremeret incertum esset*. On the other hand that the Etruscans, who are acknowledged to have derived their divination from Babylonia,¹ did actually possess such a manual is made quite certain not merely by the historic reliance in the Etruscan science of divination by thunder and lightning on the part of the Romans but from the fact that such a treatise on divination from earthquakes is actually known to have existed in Babylonia and Assyria and to have been translated in Greek, so that it was probably among the earliest Etruscan documentary assets.²

My interpretation of the *fulmen Veiovis*³ as the subterranean lightning of volcanic eruptions finds support in Pliny, Caecina (ap. Senecam) and Martianus Capella.

The Romans themselves were satisfied with regarding all day lightnings as from Jupiter and all night lightnings as from Summanus,⁴ apparently a nocturnal Jupiter. For any more particularized speculations they called upon the Etruscan experts. The Etruscan system required a division of the heavens for divination by thunder and lightning into sixteen

¹ See Jastrow, *Religious Belief in Babylonia and Assyria*, p. 195: cf. his *Die Religion Babyloniens u. Assyriens*, pp. 800, 320-321 and *passim*. Modestov, *op. cit.*, p. 388.

² Bezold u. Boll, *Reflexe astrolog. Keilschriften bei griechischen Schriftstellern* (in *Abhandl. Akad. Heidelberg*, 1911): cf. Jastrow, *Die Religion*, etc.

³ The unfamiliarity with the name Vediovis, MS Vegonices, has caused some doubt as to the reading of the word in the MSS, but, as in the case of the two passages of Livy regarding the temples of Vediovis, the reading Vediovis may be accepted. Thulin refuses to accept the reading Vediovis and prefers Begois. In this he goes against Gelenius, Eyssenhardt and Bormann; see *Arch. Epig. Mitth. aus Oest.* 1887, XI, p. 100, and Thulin, *Etr. Disc. I. Die Blitzlehre*, pp. 4, 36.

⁴ Wissowa, 124, 472; Fowler, R. F., p. 160-161. The connection of Summanus with the manes and underworld, which Wissowa denies, is asserted by Martianus Capella (II 161) and confirmed by the black animals used in his sacrifices and by Arnobius V 37 and VI 3 whom Wissowa himself cites.

sections radiating from the centre, four in each of the four divisions made by the intersecting lines of *cardo* and *decumanus* S-N and E-W, and beginning at the north running east and south. The number is certified by Cicero and Pliny,¹ but it is in the extraordinary work of archaistic erudition of Martianus Capella that these sixteen divisions are described as to their spiritual content, beginning at the upper or north pole and working down from left to right. The auspicious omens occur in the first eight divisions, those of the left, the inauspicious originate in the right hand half; the very luckiest being near the north end on the left and the most unlucky near the same point on the right. It was, of course, understood that, in marking out this *templum*, the auspiciant faced the south and so had the east or source of fortune on his left.

In each of the sixteen divisions Martianus Capella² places presiding gods or spirits, according to a scheme which is generally granted to be of Etruscan origin. On the unlucky right or west side, in the Fifteenth section, next to the last, is the name Vediovis together with the *di publici*. The last, or Sixteenth section, is ruled by the god of darkness, Nocturnus, while on the other side of Vediovis, in section Fourteen, is Saturn, also exerting a dark and evil influence. Beyond, in Thirteen and Eleven, are the *di manes*, the underworld spirits.

By the presence of Vediovis in this scheme and by the company he keeps we are confirmed in the belief that Vediovis was both a thunder and lightning god and also that his sphere of action was infernal. Now Bouché-Leclercq considers these two characteristics irreconcilable. Thunder and lightning belong to the sky and it did not seem to him as if they could by any reasoning be connected with the infernal regions³; and yet he was obliged to recognize the coexistence of both characteristics in Vediovis. He was reduced to the suggestion that the *fulgura* of Vediovis might be those very low on the horizon! But as the horizon is certainly as much as any other a part of the sky this is no solution, and the difficulty itself seems not to have been met or even stated by any other writer.

¹ N. H. II 54, 142; cf. Cicero de div. II 18, 42.

² I, 15; cf. Nissen, *Das Templum*, 182 sqq., and Bouché-Leclercq, *Hist. de la divin.* IV, p. 23 sqq.

³ *Hist. de la divin.* IV, p. 36, n. 5.

The solution, however, is extremely simple. I found it in a study of the various classes of fulgurations catalogued by the Etruscans. The most detailed summaries of the Etruscan scheme are given by Pliny and Seneca. The latter statement¹ is taken from Caecina's monograph on the subject which is based on the Etruscan system. Now Caecina gives eleven distinct categories of *fulgura*, and of these one is not celestial but infernal, coming up from the bowels of the earth: *inferna* (*fulgura*), *cum e terra exilivit ignis*. He is, of course, describing volcanic eruptions or emanations under a term that will include all varieties. Pliny also gives volcanic eruptions as a form of fulguration recognized in the Etruscan system.² His remarks on this part of the subject are more detailed than on any other and need quoting here because they also explain the arrows in the hand of the statue of Vediovis already alluded to. He says that those *fulgura* which the Etruscans call *infera* are the most frightful and destructive, coming not from the heavens but from the near-by and turbulent forces of nature. Their strokes do not fall obliquely, as do the celestial bolts, but straight, and are regarded as coming from the earth, *creduntur e terra exire*.

That the idea of a subterranean form of thunder and lightning was not peculiar to Etruria but was a familiar one to Greece can readily be proved, as, for instance, in Aeschylus, Prometheus 1103 sqq., βρυχία δ' ἤχῳ παραμυκάται | βροντῆς, ἔλικες δ' ἐκλάμπουσι | στεροπῆς ζάπυροι, κ. τ. λ.

It may then be taken for granted that infernal fulguration formed an intrinsic and important part of Etruscan divina-

¹ Q. Nat. II 49.

² N. H. II 138: Tuscorum litterae novem deos emittere fulmina existimant, eaque esse undecim generum; Iovem enim trina iaculari. Romani duo tantum ex iis servavere, diurna attribuentes Iovi, nocturna Summano, rariora sane eadem de causa frigidioris caeli. Etruria erumpere terra quoque arbitratur, quae infera appellat, brumali tempore facta saeva maxime et execrabilia, cum sint omnia, quae terrena existimant, non illa generalia nec a sideribus venientia, sed ex proxima atque turbidiore natura. Argumentum evidens, quod omnia superiora e caelo decidentia obliquos habent ictus, haec autem, quae vocant terrena, rectos. Et quae ex propiore materia cadunt, ideo creduntur e terra exire, quoniam ex repulso nulla vestigia edunt, cum sit illa ratio non inferi ictus, sed adversi. For earthquake thunder see the *Vita* of Gallienus, § 5, and Gordian, § 26. Ceres and Persephone were invoked after them: Obseq. 43. 46.

tion; and that while celestial fulguration could be both lucky and unlucky, this infernal fulguration was unmitigatedly evil.¹

The personification of this natural force among the Etruscans as well as among the Italic peoples was undoubtedly Vediovis. His relation to Jupiter, as presiding over a corresponding yet radically different mode of action is now clear. The undisciplined violence of this action is well rendered by the prefix *ve* in one of its meanings. Though his source of energy is distinct from Jupiter's,—one the heaven and the other the underworld,—their field of operation coincides.

There is in the museum of the Antiquarium Comunale at Rome what seems to be a representation of Vediovis.² It is reproduced in Pais, *Ancient Legends*, p. 166, under the caption "A Roman deity". The figure occupies the centre of the gable of some small monument. The upper part is half-man and half-bird, while the lower half is in the form of a double coiled serpent. The head is that of an old bearded man, and from his shoulders stand out two large wings. In his right hand he holds a thunderbolt of three straight bolts and his left hand is raised. There could hardly be imagined a better way for Roman Art under Etruscan influence to figure Vediovis. The serpent represents his fundamentally chthonic nature; the straight thunderbolts the subterranean fulgurations; the wings and feathers the aerial flight of the volcanic matter.

It is mainly due to the keen perception of Babelon that Vediovis has been recognized on a number of Roman family coins of the late Republic, not in the doubtful bearded form of the relief just described, but in the guise of a beardless youth such as the descriptions of the cult statue of Vediovis in Ovid and Gellius would lead us to expect. First of all is a coin of the gens Iulia of 88 B. C., issued by L. Julius Bursio.³ It should be placed at the head of the series because the Bovillae inscription shows that the gens Iulia was addicted to the cult of Vediovis. The youthful head has curly hair and a laurel wreath, with Hermes wings at the temples. On the reverse a Cupid is trying to break over his knees a bundle of arrows in

¹ See Ammianus Marcellinus, loc. cit.

² Helbig's Führer does not mention it.

³ Babelon, *Monnaies de la répub. rom.* II 6-8.

the form of thunderbolts—probably a form of *taboo* to prevent harm from volcanic eruption. The wings are natural in a god of aerial activities. In regard to the laurel wreath it is interesting to note¹ that according to Etruscan and Roman tradition the laurel tree cannot be struck by lightning, so that it is natural it should be consecrated to Vediovis, who was probably regarded as its co-protector with Jupiter.

Perhaps to the same year (88 B. C.) belongs another important Vediovis coin, that of M. Fonteius C. f.,² already recognized by Müller-Wernicke as a Vediovis. This is even more convincing than the Julian coin because besides the lightning under the head on the obverse, the reverse is occupied by the youthful genius of Vediovis on a goat, with the bolt repeated underneath. In some cases there is an interesting connection with the Dioscuri and the Lares of Rome, represented either by their caps or their full-seated figures. An interesting coin of the gens Caesia, of slightly earlier date, gives Vediovis on the obverse as a bust, seen almost from the back and turning to the left. He is in the act of launching a handful of arrows—the straight lightning bolts. The two seated Lares with their dog occupy the reverse (Babelon I, 281). Probably this act of launching the bolts is a reproduction of the cult statue. The same type and the same act is repeated in a coin of the gens Licinia, issued c. 82 B. C. by C. Licinius Macer (Babelon, II 133). The launching is done by drawing the right hand back sharply above the shoulder.³

If, on the one hand, the Etruscan, Sabine and Latin connections of Vediovis might lead us to consider him a generic Italiot divinity; on the other hand, his volcanic character

¹ Thulin, art. Haruspices in Pauly-Wissowa², p. 2448 with a reference to Pliny, N. H. II 146, XV 153.

² Cohen, *Med. Cons.* pl. 18, 5; Babelon, *ibid.*, I 506 sqq.; 507, 10; Müller-Wernicke, *Ant. Denkm.*, pl. V. 15; p. 60: "Die Vorderseite zeigt den lockigen, bartlosen Kopf des lorberbekränzten Veiovis . . . Unter dem Kopfe der Blitz. Auf der Rückseite erblickt man in einem Lorberkranze den Genius des Veiovis als geflügelten Knaben auf einer Ziege nach rechts reitend; unterhalb wieder den Blitz".

³ Other types of Vediovis appear on coins of the gens Ogulnia (Babelon II 266) and of the gens Gargilia, previous to 81 B. C. (Babelon I 532), though these are not as convincingly identified. It is a question whether the deity in a quadriga launching the thunderbolt on the reverse of the Ogulnia coin is a Vediovis or a Jupiter.

would restrict the area of his cult to the sections of Italy where volcanic action was feared, during the period approximately between 1000 and 600 B. C., that is, South Etruria, Latium, Campania and their vicinity. The weakening of volcanic action in historic times, except in a very few centres, accounts for the early obscurity or obliteration of the cult, which lasted longest in the Alban neighborhood.

It would seem as if there were not one of the facts connected with the god and his cult that does not harmonize with the volcanic theory. More than this, no other theory explains them all as it does.

Beginning as a god of certain early tribes such as the Latins and Sabines, he was adopted by the Etruscans and given a place in their system of divination. To them are probably due certain developments in the evolution of his cult. In his primitive form he must be thought of as an earth deity and not as an underworld deity in the Hellenic sense. It has been well said that the primitive Italians cared and thought very little about the underworld. He was chthonic like Terra Mater, only more subterranean in that he had no normal contact with the earth's surface. When the cycle of Underworld gods was brought into Roman religious thought by Greek influence, one quite sees how, in a spirit of fun, a Roman wit could create a new class of middle gods, *di medioximi*,¹ the earth-gods that the old Romans loved, half-way between the sky-gods and the new gods of the underworld ruled by Dis and Persephone. In this shifting of cosmic scenery it was natural that Vediovis should be juggled into the underworld, as we have seen, and should be associated or confounded with Dis-Pluto. In this connection I must discuss somewhat at length a curious late attempt to galvanize the Vediovian cult. It has but little connection with my theory except as an instance of the infiltration of combined

¹ Wissowa¹, 33 A. 5; 188 A. 8: Plautus, Cist. 572, at ita me di deaeque superi atque inferi et medioximi. But was it just a joke with Plautus? When Serv. Aen. III 134 says: quidam aras superiorum deorum volunt esse, medioximorum id est marinorum focos, inferorum vero mundos, he seems to refer in a twisted fashion to what was perhaps a transitory but real distinction before the supremacy of the Hellenic underworld had become thoroughly established.

Hellenic and late Oriental ideas into a primitive Etrusco-Roman substratum.

I find the clearest trace of this archaistic revival in a passage of Martianus Capella, whose chart of the heavenly templum shows him, as we have seen, to have been acquainted with the place of Vediovis in the Etruscan fulgural system. He makes his principal allegorical impersonation, Philology, obtain immortality through a magic brew and not by anyone of the several more or less magical methods advocated by different Eastern and Western systems. The first of these methods to which he refers is the Etruscan, which makes the soul escape by means of Vedius or Vediovis. But Philology is not to pass through his hands: *quod nec Vedium cum uxore conspexerit sicut suadet Etruria* (II 142). Exactly what rôle Vedius plays in Martianus Capella appears further in the text where, after discussing Pluto as Summanus and the various classes of infernal spirits such as the Manes, Lemures, Larvae and Maniae, he describes the disturbed region of fiery Phlegethon in Hades where the conflicting currents of heat and dampness produce a condition of continual noise and disturbance, a region of suffering through which souls restlessly flit. This region of Pyriphlegethon is presided over by Vedius also called Dis or Veiovis.¹ One is at once reminded of Pliny's description of the violent interaction of compressed hot and cold air as the condition producing earthquakes;² of the name *Φλέγρας πεδίων* given to the volcanic plain of Campania, and of the various fulgural and volcanic connections of the root *φλέγω* and its derivatives.

¹ Martian. Cap. II 40-41 (166) Circa ipsum vero terrae circulum aer ex calore supero atque exhalatu madoreque infero turbidatus egredientes corporibus animas quodam fluenti aestu collidens non facile patitur evolare. Hincque tractum Pyriphlegethonta sollertia poeticae adumbrationis allusit atque in eo perenni strepitu volutata colliditur animarum, quas Vedius adiudicavit, impietas (id est <Pluton) quem etiam Ditem Veiovemque dixere. Ipsam quoque terram qua hominibus invia est, etc. The volcanic connection is employed in Plato's *Phaedo*, p. 113 B. Cf. *Odyssey* X 513, *Vergil Aen.* VI 550 ff. See Lucian's *κατάπλωνς*, ch. 28, and for a bath in the Pyriphlegethon, the *Dialogues of the Dead*, ch. 30.

² Pliny II 81 says that the trembling of the earth resembles thunder in the clouds and the yawning of the earth (in volcanic eruption) is like bursts of lightning.

The section of the infernal regions then, over which Vediovis presided, according to this account in Martianus Capella was the *Pyriphlegethon*, or region where earthquakes and eruptions were produced, and throughout which souls were balloted back and forth on conflicting currents. What is not clear is how far the sphere and character of Vediovis was expanded to amalgamate with the Hellenic concept of Dis-Pluton, and how far it can be ascribed in the form here given to it to an Etruscan source.

Does this also help to define the relation of Vediovis to the *hostiae animales*, to the sacrifice of the goat *ritu humano*, and to the somewhat late concept of the escape of souls from probation or torment to the abode of the blessed?

It seems implied in Martianus Capella that according to the Etruscan system the souls passed out by means or by permission of Vediovis. The passing back and forth of souls was a familiar idea in various forms of palingenesis, reincarnation, temporary visitations to the world of mortals by the manes, lemures and other spirits. In the *Aeneid* (VI 685) Vergil has voiced the current conception as to the form in which souls were even then, and more commonly in later times,¹ supposed to pass out and upward as pure atoms of the original fiery energy or aether, of the active force of fire. This is in harmony with the ideas of Stoicism and astrology as to the origin of souls from the mass of fiery aether and with the vivid fancies of Plato. The expulsion of souls in the form of fiery atoms, through openings violently made in the earth's crust by the agency of the volcanic god Vediovis, is therefore a method thoroughly in harmony with all that we know of ancient thought.

But while recognizing this we must guard against two things: (1) against ascribing to the original Vediovis or even to the Etrusco-Roman Vediovis any of the later anthropomorphic and infernal ideas connected with the Dis-Pluto cult introduced by Hellenism: (2) against doing the same for ideas connected with life in and beyond the stars which were

¹ Serv. Aen. IV 56 and III 231: a lost work by Labeo was entitled *De Diis animalibus*; cf. Macrob. III 5, 1-4, with reference to a work by Trebatius, in which the second species of *hostia* is that in quo sola anima deo sacratur, unde etiam haruspices animales has *hostias* vocant.

an even later introduction of the post-Alexandrian and imperial ages, though current long before then in Oriental and Hellenic spheres.

In other words it must be recognized that while there was in early Italic-Etruscan religion a strong element of doctrine as to life beyond the grave, represented in the Libri Acheruntici, and that, in view of the derivation of Etruscan ideas from Babylon this doctrine may have had a sidereal aspect; still, it is clear that scepticism and Hellenism had almost obliterated such early beliefs, until they were revived in more philosophical, elaborate and extreme forms, in the late Republic and the empire, and finally remodelled by belated scholarship through a study of Etruscan documents.

All that can be safely predicated of the post-Etruscan concept of Vediovis in so far as it related to life after death, is that he is thought to preside over the passing out of souls in the form of fiery atoms from a place of torment to one of bliss and immortality, wherever that may have been, and that this act could be brought about by the vicarious sacrifice of a goat *ritu humano*, on behalf of the dead person. At the same time the connection of the goat with Vediovis was probably much earlier than any such association of ideas and goes back to a fairly early Italic-Etruscan ritual.

A. L. FROTHINGHAM.

PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY.

III.—AN OXFORD SCHOLAR.¹

Owing to the death of Cook Wilson, the eminent Aristotelian and close friend of Ingram Bywater, the preparation of a memoir of the great Oxford scholar was committed to another intimate, Dr. Jackson, the former Rector of Bywater's college, Exeter. In the change of biographers something may have been lost in the way of detailed description and minute analysis of Bywater's achievements in the special line of work with which his name will ever be associated so long as Greek scholarship abides, but the essentials are there and as others have emphasized, the individuality of the scholar and the man could hardly have been more vividly portrayed. The biographer himself disappears. There is hardly a word from Jackson about Jackson. Such self-effacement is rare and we cannot call Bywater up to tell us what Jackson meant in his life. The other influences of time, place and person are brought out now in sharp outline, now in bright colours; and near friend as well as casual acquaintance will rise from the perusal of the fascinating volume with a truer appreciation of a rare personality.

Bywater's life was the typical life of a scholar, the life of a *λάθε βιώσας* man. It had not the adventitious interest of contact with great military, great political movements. In the Seven Years' War Reiske is a figure not to be forgotten. Paul Louis Courier was a soldier as well as a Hellenist. In the German War of Liberation many philologists went to the front and in our Civil War many scholars of military age—the Southerners almost without exception—shewed that the martial notes of Tyrtaios had not lost their edge. It was only the other day that we were told how a Cambridge don, accounted the chief among the younger Hellenists, had acquired a different fame

¹Ingram Bywater. *The Memoir of an Oxford Scholar 1840-1914*. By WILLIAM WALROND JACKSON, D.D., Honorary Fellow, formerly Rector, of Exeter College, Oxford. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1917.

as the drill-master of a rifle corps; and in a recent number of the *American Journal of Philology* an eminent English scholar is quoted as lamenting that he was too old and too deaf to be of active service to his country,¹ a lamentation not without echo on this side of the water. It was only as the shades of night were gathering about his head that Bywater was confronted by the spectre of a war that throws a ghastly light not only on the present and the future but also on the past of all that lived and loved the life of German scholarship as he did; for though Bywater had never studied under German masters, he was thoroughly familiar with German methods and doubtless counted among his highest honours those that came to him from the Berlin Academy. When the crisis came, he was heart and soul with his people. οὐ γνώμα διπλόαν θέτο βουλάν
But he felt the wrench.

So rapid has been the process of estrangement that one hesitates to say what might have been said three years ago that his ideal of scholarship was German rather than English. And yet the German domination was over all who wished to do anything serious. In 1869 Bywater wrote to Bernays 'I am quite aware how much my dissertation falls short of a German standard of philological knowledge'—a humility hardly justified by the ruck of German dissertations, accepted as they are by those who are supposed to hold up the German standard. Many years have passed since the utilization of every German dissertation was deemed essential to the completeness of any line of research. But exactness and exhaustiveness are characteristic of the best German work and exactness and exhaustiveness were characteristic of Bywater. What he achieved was not to be done over again. On the other hand, on the English side, if you choose, there was in all his work a neatness and a finish in the presentation of his results that one misses in the cumbrousness of so many German performances. 'Versus et cetera ludicra' he left behind him in his undergraduate days, and he was evidently of the opinion of Cobet as to those 'qui Graeca carmina pangunt quae neque Graeca sunt neque carmina'. True, Latin was to him a precious vessel, not merely a conventional vehicle, but he had no fondness for oratorical

¹ A. J. P. XXXVIII 211.

display, or for display of any kind and when it became a part of his official duties as Regius Professor of Greek to present candidates for honorary degrees, he gladly transferred the task to his friend Farnell. There may have been a touch of Bywaterian mischief in the assignment of claims that he may have deemed mythical to a distinguished mythographer. No stronger contrast could be imagined than that between Jowett and his successor, both in ideals and practice. Jowett revelled in translation, Bywater was averse to it, and when he yielded to the demand, it was not so much translation as paraphrase that accompanied his text. The charm of Jowett's translations is undeniable. They have brought him imperishable fame, but for the technical Grecian the charm is soon dissipated and in difficult passages one recalls the words of an audacious critic who said apropos of Jowett that sitting astride upon a fence is endangering to virility. It is a transgression of one of Ritschl's memorable precepts¹ which is a Biblical precept as well. There must be no halting between two opinions.

Of course Jowett figures in this volume, as who does not among the classical scholars of England? For Dr. Jackson has given us a portrait gallery of the time, a series of etchings that may serve as an accompaniment to Sir John Sandys' sketches of the scholars of the nineteenth century. Fifty at least of the names in Dr. Jackson's Index have crossed the track of my own studies and appear for good or evil in the thirty-seven volumes of the *American Journal of Philology*; and one can readily imagine the hero of Dr. Jackson's story, as he reflects an exemplar here, appraises a fellow-worker there, and turns on this and that figure the light of a wit that burns as well as illuminates. He did not lisp in Greek as in later days he somewhat maliciously lisped in English, but when he took up the study he made admirable progress in it and his father provided his only child with tutors of exceptionable ability, James Bryce, Robinson Ellis and T. H. Green. That was before the era of sports, whereas in 1880 when I reported the performance of

¹ Ritschl's words are: Nicht mit schiefen halben Gedanken ohne eindringliche Interpretation sich begnügen (Ribbeck, Friedrich Ritschl I 240). Approximately rendered A. J. P. V 350: Don't be satisfied with half notions, squinting thoughts. Go to the heart of the matter in your interpretation.

the Agamemnon at Balliol, I recorded the characteristic fact that the chief actors were among the leading athletes of the University. Bywater cared for none of these things. Even the river had no charm for him. Nor was there so much personal guidance in studies then as there is now. And after all there is such a thing as too much guidance. The American college teachers of my generation were much more poorly equipped for their work than the preceptors of to-day, but there are oldsters who are grateful for the freedom granted them to work out their own salvation or damnation, as the case might be. The light came to Bywater in large measure from luminaries without the college walls or from the beaming faces of his college-mates. Bywater's great hero was Carlyle; and to the end of his days, we are told, he had much of the spirit of Carlyle and like his friend, Swinburne, accorded him the first place among the writers of his day 'on account of his literary gifts, his hatred of shams, his penetrating and incisive criticism of conventional beliefs'—the things that won the allegiance of Thackeray. Among Bywater's friends was Walter Pater¹; with Swinburne his relations were especially cordial and William Morris was also one of his intimates. Jowett predicted for both Bywater and Pater a first class in *Literae Humaniores*, but Pater fell from scholarly grace into the arms of the Graces of Style and however he may have succeeded in reëmbodiment the spirit of Plato, he failed lamentably in mastering the technicalities of Greek scholarship. The other half of Jowett's prophecy came true. In 1862 Bywater left college with a first class and in 1863 he was made Fellow of Exeter College; and a Fellow of Exeter he remained until the year of his marriage in 1885. The duty of providing for his mother, which the death of his father devolved upon him, a duty which he discharged faithfully for forty years, barred any prospect of marriage, and he settled down to the life of the college of

¹ A. J. P. XV 93. In after years Bywater wrote what seems to me an admirably just estimate of Pater, too long to quote entire. One extract must suffice. 'His style I do not like; it seems to me affected and pretentious and often sadly wanting in lucidity. It is much admired by a small but devout body of followers, very superior persons in their own view though of little importance in the view of the large literary public in this country.' (I. B. to Diels.)

which he was to be the great ornament. Soon after his election to the Fellowship he became intimate with Mark Pattison, one of the determining influences of his life, and Dr. Jackson devotes page after page to a characteristic of that remarkable scholar for whom in after years—sad to relate—Bywater's friend and fellow-admirer of Carlyle, Swinburne, had no better title than that of an Ape of the Dead Sea.¹

Pattison and Pattison's brilliant wife—afterwards to be the wife of Sir Charles Dilke of unhappy celebrity—formed the centre of a unique society into which Bywater was drawn and of which he became a privileged member. Pattison was the representative of the tendencies which ultimately gained the upper hand in the direction of academic studies, the removal of confessional restrictions, the shifting of weight from college to university, the admission of the claims of physical science. In the Pattison circle the continental atmosphere was regnant and Bywater had prepared himself for the Pattison environment by acquiring a practical familiarity with the German language, which at that time was not a common accomplishment in English universities.² In the last thirty years of his life, Pattison's interest was concentrated on classical learning, its methods and its relation to life. 'Classical learning i. e. a knowledge of human nature as exhibited in antiquity'—such was his thesis—'expands the soul as no other learning can expand it' and in this faith he upheld the scientific ideal of scholarship in opposition to those who considered 'the refinement of taste and of the critical faculty and the command of Latin and Greek as instruments of literary skill to be the best fruits of scholarship'. Bywater's view of the functions and responsibilities of scholarship coincided with Pattison's; he had the same conception of thoroughness as Pattison. To him as to Pattison, Scaliger was a model and Bywater was to treat the late Aristotelians as Scaliger treated the writers who held precious fragments of the Eusebian Chronicle. Bernays' *Life of Scaliger* was and is an inspiration, and like Pattison—to continue Dr. Jackson's summary—Bywater never forgot that the final end of scholarship was to throw light on literature and

¹ *The Nineteenth Century*, 1893, p. 916.

² *A. J. P.* III 228, al.

history. But Bywater, we are told further, was not merely receptive, he always preserved his individuality, always complied, it may be added, with the canons of taste, which Pattison violated with a certain savagery. No such jumble of metaphors can be produced from the works of any scholar as may be found in the writings of Mark Pattison.¹

Bywater early recognized the limitations of the province he had marked out for himself. A happy lot is the lot of the specialist after all.

Beatus ille qui procul negotiis
<Angusta> rura bobus exercet suis.

Within these bounds he kept himself. It cost him some effort to do it, says Dr. Jackson. It meant the renunciation of popular fame. 'He was little known', says the Spectator in a sympathetic notice of Dr. Jackson's Memoir, 'outside his own circle, even in Oxford, except as a profound Aristotelian'. It was a self-denying ordinance which could best be appreciated by those who knew or divined the vast range of his knowledge. And it is this concentration that commands the respect of those who belong nominally to the same guild and yet are prone to seek the key of the fields and shy their doctor's caps over the mills of the gods of Greece and Rome, though as they shy them they are not so lost to the technicalities of their business as not to remark on the current mistranslation of the proverb:

ὄψε θεῶν ἀλέουσι μύλοι, ἀλέουσι δὲ λεπτά.

The mills of the gods grind late, not slowly, and pulverizing criticisms are sometimes kept back for a score of years.

Like Pattison and through Pattison, Bywater cultivated the acquaintance of Jakob Bernays, a personality unforgettable to an old Bonn student.² There was an intellectual kinship between the two men, with their wide knowledge, their incisive style, their mordant wit. The privatdocent of 1852 was not so awesome a figure to me as he became in later days when Usener copied one of his essays with his own hand³ and when Bywater

¹ A specimen of Pattison's style is given in *Hellas and Hesperia*, p. 24: "Even at this day a country squire or rector in *landing* with his *cub* under his *wing* in Oxford finds himself very much at *sea*."

² A. J. P. XXXIII 230.

³ A. J. P. XXVII 228.

wrote him those reverential letters—among the few that have been preserved.

Another thing Bywater had in common with Pattison—and that was the passion for collecting rare books. He was elected a member of the Roxburghe Club in 1891 and continued to take an active part in its proceedings until his death. The marvellous editions that he brought together he bequeathed to the Bodleian but he did not cling to the possession of his books in the 'contemplor in arca' spirit, for he made generous gifts to scholars who were working in the same line with himself. But though Bywater had so much in common with Pattison, he was, as Dr. Jackson has rightly insisted, no *umbra* of anybody. There went out of him the spirit of true scholarship. His touch was sharp and clear and masterly and both in his reserves and his achievements there was an impress of finality. His work was a carven monument, not a chance Monte Testaccio and there are those who would gladly exchange the ready evocation of miscellaneous reading, the sophistic legerdemain of far-fetched combinations, the joyous play of frolic fancy for the good conscience of a solid contribution to the sum of that which is known. This is not merely the old 'optat arare caballus' story. Everyone who has been consecrated to scholarship hopes to do something that will abide, be it never so little, something that will live on in company with the index-maker, the palaeographer, the framer of irrefragable formulae.

Dr. Jackson's third chapter deals with social life at Oxford for the twenty years that lay between Bywater's entrance upon his fellowship and his marriage. He had, as we have seen, settled upon the work of his life, the study of the language and literature of Greek philosophy—no narrow range to any just conception of the undertaking. Homer is the Okeanos that compasses all Greek life, out of which and into which flow all the streams of Hellenism. But such is the connexion of all the waterways of the Greek paradise, that any one channel leads to all, and Aristotle is, as Bywater himself has said,¹ a syndicate of the wealth of Hellenism; and an intimate knowledge of the Greek language in its literary manifestations from the

¹He used to say, 'Aristotle in his later years at least became a syndicate'.

beginning to the latest exponent of the doctrines of Academy and Lyceum is a prime condition for the work Bywater had set himself to do; and those who sneer at scholia and scholiasts as Rutherford did¹ are in great danger of laughing as did the suitors of Penelope; and the 'supra grammaticam' gentlemen that interpret Plato expose themselves to the divine smile of the great prose poet, if indeed there be a limbo in which the ancient worthies meet their modern commentators. Somehow Plato's smile would be more withering than the 'Hohngelächter der Hölle'—to use a favourite German phrase that suits the diabolism of the present day. Bywater knew his Greek and when one thinks of him one recalls what Fontenelle said about the hand full of truth and the opening of the little finger.

Bywater, we are told, was not the advocate of any philosophical system. His business was to find out what his text meant, not to fit the meaning when found into a scheme of his own. 'Some form of Hegelianism had perhaps more attraction for him because of the intellectual basis of the system'. But apart from this, all classical study in his day, which I may call my day, was steeped in Hegelianism. The air swarmed with winged words from the Hegelian oracle. In 1850 historians of Greek philosophy walked humbly on the lines of the Hegelian logic. Indeed the revolt against the Hegelian triads² of Greek literature arose within times that seem to me, an ancient of days, comparatively recent. Bywater's admiration of Matthew Arnold belongs also to his time. George Bernard Shaw introduces his cultured American³ as still in the Matthew Arnold stage. In 1861 some of my fellow-campaigners carried in their scant baggage copies of Matthew Arnold's essays. Men trained in Continental schools were in sympathy with Arnold's criticisms of English character and English methods. The proud disdain that overspread his features was reflected by his disciples. Few of the younger men of that day were not blinded by the flash of his epigrams; few hesitated to accept his convenient formulae. Among German writers Heine was Bywater's favourite—and no wonder. Heine was what the Hebrews call the mouth of the sword, and Bywater was a master of incisive speech. Such a one too was Swift, another favourite of Bywater's—and

¹ A. J. P. XVIII 245.

² A. J. P. XXXIII 106.

³ A. J. P. XXXVI 110.

indeed eighteenth century literature had an especial attraction for him, as it has for all who love neatness and despatch.

College commons, Dr. Jackson tells us, in 1864 were much more centres of intercourse between the members of the different colleges than they have since become. The life of the common room at Oxford, of the combination room at Cambridge was fading out when I first knew it. Family life had begun to displace college life and the Punch of the day made merry over the perambulator that thrust the chariot of the Muses off the track. In some of the smaller colleges, the foreign guest sometimes found himself alone with his host and on one occasion that I recall the lamentation over the neglect of Pindar was coupled with a lamentation over the decline of port. But there were still 'noctes cenaque deum' and still more delightful are the memories of the gatherings in the rooms of the individual dons; and this is the kind of hospitality which Bywater favoured and in which he shone, the bright talk revolving about his precious collection of books, enriched from year to year. In 1866 he went abroad largely to make the acquaintance of Zeller and so came into contact with the fringe of war. The hotels were full of Prussian officers—'far less imperious and offensive then than they afterwards became'. My acquaintance with Prussian officers goes back to the Berlin of 1850-1851, and Kranzler's 'Conditorei'. Anything more imperious and offensive than the 'Herrn von der Garde' of that date is to me hardly conceivable. But in all things the Germans go on to perfection. Still at the time under consideration, there was nothing of the 'Schrecklichkeit' which is the watchword of to-day, and there was something like chivalry in the bearing of Borussia warriors and Bavarian toward one another.

With all Bywater's admiration of German scholarship, he was not blind to the defects of the German mind, to the self-conceit that led both scholars and men of science to depreciate the literary and scientific achievements of others and became so marked after 1870, the year which made so deep a cleft in my own life.¹ On Pattison's advice Bywater refrained from engaging in a literary feud with Teichmüller, the author of

¹A. J. P. XXXVI 240.

'Literarische Fehden' and himself not disinclined to controversy. A legitimate instance of being too proud to fight. Bywater was quite alive to the danger of overspecialization, and though Dr. Jackson calls no name, it was doubtless Bywater who pointed out in *Athenaeum* or *Academy* the egregious lapse of Lucian Müller who undertook to correct Vergil's 'contemplator item'¹ which he took for a fragment of a lost writer.

At the time of the Franco-Prussian War, Pattison was anti-Gallican, as were most of the Oxford residents. But Bywater distrusted Germany from the first and 'the cultivation and the spirit and refinement of the educated Frenchman were far more to Bywater's taste than the self-assertion of the average German', his 'grasping and pretentious attitude'. Still his friendships were formed with scholars irrespectively of nationality, whether it were Bernays or Mommsen or Taine or Renan. But Bywater lived long enough to declare himself wholeheartedly on the side of the Allies and the famous rescript of the 93 was accepted as a finality just as it has been by so many who have had closer ties with Germany than ever Bywater had.

The twenty years that followed Bywater's election to the Fellowship of Exeter saw many academic changes. Large sums were expended in promoting the study of natural sciences. Students were allowed to become members of the University without belonging to College or Hall. Girls as well as boys were admitted to local examinations. Colleges for women were founded and University examinations thrown open to them. The movement known as University Extension was set on foot, but from this movement Bywater, though a liberal, stood aloof, as was to be expected of his fastidious nature. Nor is it surprising that when the great question as to Compulsory Greek came up he was in favour of freedom. Not that he underrated the cultural value of Greek, but he had the 'Pierian spring' attitude of the eighteenth century. Whether he consoled himself, as I have consoled myself this many a year, with the belief that the cubic contents of Greek study were greater than ever, I do not know.² The Test Act by which the endowments were

¹A. J. P. XXXVII 498.

²'I see the handwriting on the wall everywhere', he wrote in May 1906, 'even in Germany and am not hopeful as to the future of the old humanities'.

secularized met his hearty approval, and the only public controversy in which Bywater was ever involved had to do with that reform. The improvement of teaching was one of his great concerns, but he took little active part in the training of pupils. Among his few pupils were Driver, the eminent Hebrew scholar and Macan, the editor of Herodotus.¹ His teaching, we are told, was characterized by finish and thoroughness. He was not content to correct mistakes. He gave an example of the kind of answer that he himself would have returned to the question set. It is an open secret that your successful coach is the man who knows the examiner as well as the subject, but with this psychological study Bywater had no sympathy. The fads of an examiner had no interest for him. 'His Honour pupils were often the subject of very pointed sarcasms. But they rather treasured them than resented them. The undergraduate will forgive a great deal to a man whom they admire and who is never commonplace or humdrum.' So Dr. Jackson, who knows. 'Humdrum' reminds me of the plaint of a German usher. I cannot recall the exact words, but the following echo may serve as an illustration:

Humdrum, humdrum, humdrum, humdrum,
My heart is woe, my brain is numb,
My mental vision's choked with gum.
I never could be made to stomach
Caesar's *Bellum Gallicum*.

But that was long before the new methods that have made Caesar as alive as he was to Cleopatra.

Another innovation was a scheme of joint lectures open to all the colleges and Bywater's lectures on Aristotle's *Poetics* and Plato's *Republic* were crowded by the Honour men and the lecturer 'produced a profound impression on those who followed them as an original master, an exemplar of critical scholarship, in private, a most amusing talker and raconteur'. But that was in the days before English Guides to Conversation uttered their ban against anecdotes. It is not surprising that in his hours of ease he did not spare the great Master of Balliol any more than did Archer-Hind. When Bywater succeeded Jowett, the appointment was received with marked coolness in certain quarters, but when one compares Jowett's

¹ A. J. P. XVII 126.

original equipment for the office and recalls the 'howlers' that were afterwards attributed to him, the disparity in the eyes of a technical scholar is almost absurd.

At this point Dr. Jackson goes into some detail as to the controversy in regard to religious tests—a matter of minor interest to American scholars, and takes occasion to refer to Bywater's general attitude to religious belief. 'Bywater's ideals', he says, 'were too purely intellectual for him ever to be regarded as an example of the *anima naturaliter Christiana*'. But, as Bywater said of his friend Nettleship, 'there was a serious religious vein in his nature' and he had no sympathy with the coarser forms of theological liberalism. 'He was not the man to weaken the religious influences which helped to mould the character of young men under education.' 'He accepted the possibility of a future life, without any searchings of heart, in the firm conviction that the seeker after truth, if he were true to his vocation, had nothing to fear.'

Bywater's love of books, his familiarity with manuscripts seemed to designate him as the successor of Coxe, the guardian angel of the Bodleian, who watched over his treasures with almost superstitious care and resented any careless touch of a precious parchment; and Bywater was induced to act as sub-librarian for a while, but the conditions were unfavourable to anything like research. His great friend, Mark Pattison, said, 'The librarian who reads is lost' and Bywater would have been one of 'la perdua gente' for he wished to be a librarian who reads.

Bywater's Bibliography—his list of Books and Articles prepared by himself shortly before his death—contains only forty numbers, a comparatively small output for forty years of unceasing literary activity.¹ Of fugitive notes in Academy and Athenaeum he took no account, but only those whose business it is to write fugitive notes are aware how many hours of study and research are sometimes necessary for a single paragraph.

¹ Cf. A. J. P. XXXVII 502 fn. 'Great students in any department', says Dr. Jackson (p. 143), 'leave a permanent impression only through the influence exercised on younger men by their personality and example. Much of Bywater's higher work bore fruit in the labors of others, which would never have been undertaken but for his guidance and inspiration'.

Of public performances of an oratorical character, he was a sworn foe, as has already been noted. Bywater's chief works were his *Heraclitus*, a memorable performance, the compass of which gives no notion of its difficulty, his *Priscianus Lydus*, which he undertook under the commission of the Berlin Academy, and which brought him in unstinted praise from the foremost German scholars, the specimen of his edition of *Diogenes Laertius*, the edition which was to have been the great achievement of his life—*Madonnas of the Future* are most of our great achievements—his edition of the *Nicomachean Ethics* and the *Poetics* of Aristotle with a commentary and a manner of paraphrase—for this master of Greek seems to have been of the same opinion as Boeckh concerning translation as a warrant of supreme scholarship.¹

A critical estimate of these works, which constitute Bywater's title to a permanent place in the annals of classical study, would carry me beyond the scope of this paper, which is nothing but a summary of Dr. Jackson's admirable memoir, with sundry irresponsible intercalations of my own. Nor am I the man either to make or even to report such an estimate. An admirer of Aristotle has called him 'iron in one's blood'. Physically I have never been able to take any preparation of iron, and that may have been the trouble with my digestion of Aristotle. But that disability does not prevent my admiration of an Aristotelian, certainly not of any man who does inevitable work in the right spirit. So much philological work becomes negligible in a short time. To do work that is inevitable, and to put that work in reasonable compass and crystalline form, that is the best one can hope for. Every one of the publications I have mentioned shews the hand of the master. Every one involved long and laborious quest. But it is not Bywater's achievement that has tempted me to this holiday task. It is the combination of the personal charm of the subject of the biography and my entire sympathy with his conception of the scholar's vocation.

In 1883 Bywater was appointed to a Readership in Greek, a position which I once sought to have established in the Johns Hopkins University, an admirable coign of vantage for a scholar who is waiting for something better, if indeed there

¹ A. J. P. XXX 353.

is anything better. The very vagueness of the title is attractive though, of course, it is exposed to glosses. When Bywater was asked 'What is the difference between a Reader and a Professor?' the characteristic reply was 'A Reader is a man who reads, a Professor is a man who professes to read'. Indeed I think that most scholars balk at the title of Professor which answers very closely to the ancient 'sophistes', but when it was suggested that Praelector would be a better word, 'Which means, I suppose', rejoined Skeat, 'a man who lectures before he has read'.

In 1885 Bywater married and this vacated his fellowship. Thenceforth the London house became the centre and 93 Onslow Square a name to conjure with. Delightful memories cluster about it and a perfect stranger to me betrayed me into a tangled correspondence by pleading his intimacy with the sacred number. Mrs. Bywater had been the wife of a scholar, a Fellow of Exeter from 1851 to 1864, the date of his marriage, who kept up his relations with the former Fellows of his college. His last year as Fellow (1863-1864) was Bywater's first, and the acquaintance thus formed was continued until Mr. Sotheby's death in 1877. Mrs. Sotheby had entered heartily into all her husband's studies. She was a diligent student of classical Greek, a devotee of Homer, a mistress of Modern Greek and counted among her friends Comparetti, a review of whose famous Virgil in the Middle Ages was the last literary performance of her first husband. If, as it has been maintained, mutual admiration is the surest warrant of love, no married pair had a stronger assurance of happiness than those two, and to the truth of the inscription on that joint monument 'His amor unus erat' all who were privileged to enjoy the hospitality of that beautiful abode can bear witness. 'The marriage was not one of intellectual sympathy alone. It was a marriage of affection on both sides.' She brought a mellow afternoon light into his life, and when after a rarely happy union he was left alone by her death in 1908 in the absence of kindred of his own he found solace in the companionship of those who had been brought near to him by his marriage. Still he could say with Wallenstein 'Die Blume ist hinweg aus meinem Leben'. He withdrew more and more into the company of his beloved books. Happy the man who has the collector's passion. It

ranks next—up or down—to the passion for work—or let us say 'writing'. 'Je continue à écrire', said a French man of letters, 'incapable de faire autre chose'.¹

But let us turn back to the chief event in our hero's academic life—his election to the Regius Professorship of Greek in the University of Oxford, made vacant by the death of Jowett in 1903. The Regius Professorship of Greek at Oxford is in the gift of the Crown and therefore at that time was in the gift of Mr. Gladstone, who took this duty seriously. Of the two Greek scholars in Oxford, between whom, we are told, it would be hard to discriminate, Ingram Bywater and David Binning Monro, Provost of Oriel, Monro's eminence as an Homeric scholar might be thought to have been a recommendation in Mr. Gladstone's eyes, for Mr. Gladstone was a noted Homerist. But Mr. Gladstone's Homeric scholarship was of a very different type from Monro's and furthermore Monro was excluded by Mr. Gladstone's own rule that no head of a college was to be made Regius Professor of Greek. Bywater, it is true, was known to have made merry at Mr. Gladstone's expense in the matter of his Homeric essays but, as I have had opportunity to know, English scholars are the most generous of men toward their critics and play the game of scholarship as they play all other games. Of course there was the usual muster of testimonials. Whether they were printed or not for Mr. Gladstone's edification does not appear. We Americans are often charged with a lack of taste but there are English scholars who join with us in revolting against the circulation of printed recommendations in support of rival candidates for academic positions—these 'Süssigkeiten' as my fellow-student Vahlen called them in a letter to me apropos of 'Festschriften'. Vahlen estimated such things at their right value. It makes one shiver, at least it makes me shiver, to think that Rutherford had been pressed upon Mr. Gladstone and doubtless that 'Simia Cobeti'

¹After Mrs. Bywater's death, Bywater resigned his Professorship. 'I have a strong feeling that a professor should not remain at his post after his energies have begun to wane.' <It was to prevent such a mistake that the Carnegie Foundation was established—and 93 Onslow Square was a manner of Carnegie Foundation. J. E. B. Mayor when his audience was reduced to one undergraduate offered to resign but his resignation was not accepted. A dead line is best after all.>

could have produced testimonies enough; he had admirers enough, has them still—but his learning reminds me of what one reads of the Carso in the Austriaco-Italian campaign.¹

The succession to Jowett naturally gives rise to reflexions on the different ideals and the diverse performances of the two representatives, one the apostle of research, the other the champion of culture in the English sense. 'The application of Greek philosophy to life, not the knowledge of Greek, was Jowett's main interest.' Jowett was what we call a popularizer, the French, a '*vulgarisateur*'—not in the bad sense—and Dr. Jackson maintains that Jowett was a popularizer in the best sense and quotes Jebb's saying that Jowett made Plato an English classic. Jebb's testimony seems to weigh more than that of John Bright who declared Jowett's work to be better than Plato could have done. But John Bright knew no Greek and Jebb's rare compliments must always be carefully perpended. For that matter the Authorized Version is an English classic, the great standard of a noble tongue, and yet it was not so long ago that Bywater's pupil Driver complained that the translators were ignorant of elementary Greek syntax,² and he who wishes to know what the text means must look farther. 'Jowett', says Dr. Jackson, 'was not a scientific scholar any more than he was a scientific theologian', Dr. Jackson himself being both scholar and theologian. Bywater's conception of scholarship has already been emphasized. It is the conception that dominates our American scholarship—and as our scholarship is an offshoot of the great German Ygdrasil, we come back to questions that have recently been discussed at length both in England and America. Both Jowett and Bywater, urges Dr. Jackson, would have been agreed in the doctrine that the ultimate aim of learning is to throw light on literature and history. 'But in order to do this we must have a thorough and intimate knowledge of the remains of antiquity and Jowett was impatient of the minute research by means of which the divinations of genius are rendered possible and acquire a certainty that would otherwise be unattainable.' And, as Dr. Jackson goes on to say, 'the scientific ideal of learning does nothing to dull the

¹A. J. P. XVIII 245; XXX 359.

²A. J. P. XXXV 362.

sense of beauty or impair the consciousness of affinities between Greek thought and the highest cultivation of our day'. But that is a theme upon which I have been discoursing ever since I undertook academic work more than sixty years ago and the title of one of my deliverances *The Spiritual Rights of Minute Research* has been cited to shew my attitude to the great question. It is this common ideal that commanded the sympathy with Bywater and the admiration of Bywater expressed by such men as Zeller, Usener, Vahlen, Gomperz—Gomperz himself a shining proof that there is no incompatibility between research and imagination. The German Muse is not always as formless as the German Hausfrau is commonly supposed to be and the ἄγγελος ὀρθός must be held to deliver his message in the clear and penetrating tones of the Greek singer. Bywater's Inaugural Lecture on Three Centuries of Greek Learning in England, a precious document doubtless, has not survived. As it is easy to divine, the native causticity would not have been lacking as the discourse neared its close. At heart Bywater was a kindly man and in the wholesale destruction of letters and papers, wasp's nest and honeycomb alike perished. There is not much material from which to reconstruct the image of a personality 'at once impressive and winning'. A few specimens are given of his table talk,¹ but these sparks from the

¹ Table talk is often entertaining but almost as often misleading. Fallen leaves give no just notion of the living foliage. Still Bywater was given to epigrams and once made he was apt to repeat his aphorisms unchanged. From Professor J. E. B. Mayor's ed. of Tertullian's *Apologeticus* Introd. xiii I learn that he said to Mayor what he said to me in almost exactly the same words: 'One could read a very large part of such a writer as Plutarch in the time that is occupied on the small volume of Thucydides.'

I often think that modern education is a conspiracy on the part of schoolmasters and dons to keep men babies until they are four and twenty.

The reason <why a satisfactory biography is so rare> is that while people are alive to whom it refers, the truth cannot be told and after they are dead it can seldom be ascertained.

anvil do not restore the picture of the artificer at his work which was his play as well. 'It is difficult to convey to strangers',

The clergy are very *good* men and knowing this allow themselves a latitude of conduct which you and I could not possibly afford. <The same thing has been noted in regard to quotations from Scripture.>

'There are various reasons for buying books. Some people buy books for the contents and that is a very vulgar reason; and some people buy books for the binding, and that is a little better and not so vulgar; and others buy books for the printing, and that is really a very good reason; but the real reason for which to buy a book is the margin! Always look at the margin.' <'The margin is the thing', has a wider application. Every life should have a wide margin of interest.>

It is not so good for the intellect <to do too much palaeographical work> and the work is tolerable only when there is a distinct literary end in view.

Clever, certainly not; they have no cleverness, only an enthusiasm for cheap causes.

He called the United States the great breeding-ground of popular crazes and did not care for a superfluity of conveniences such as are necessary to the American notion of comfort. 'I do not like', he said, 'a performing house'.

A connoisseur of furniture, he said, 'The good becomes venerable with age, the bad simply shabby.' <Which applies to another kingdom as well.>

<A man's fancy for this or that witticism is a key to his taste and one more item may be added to these specimens. Bywater was a great smoker and here is an anecdote in which he took delight.>

Pio Nono, when in conversation with Cardinal Antonelli lit a cigarette and handed the case to the cardinal who said, 'You know, Holiness, that I have not that vice.' 'You know, Eminence, that if it were a vice, you would have it.'

says Dr. Jackson, 'the impress a strong individuality leaves on the minds of his friends. It cannot be done by a mere enumeration of characteristics'. But no one can read the Memoir that Dr. Jackson has consecrated to his friend without some vision of a man whom to have known at all is 'to have gained a new conception of the potentialities of scholarship'—a man whose life is a lesson for American scholars. Generous recognition and adoption of all that is best everywhere. No surrender of nationality.

BASIL L. GILDERSLEEVE.

POSTSCRIPT:—As I leave this bantling to its fate (Pind. O. 6, 45; comp. P. 4, 98) an Epimethean shiver comes over me lest some pick-thanks like the anonymous gentleman who laid a hypermetric hexameter to my charge (A. J. P. XXXV 234) should remind me that I ought to have indicated the omission of a line in my quotation from Horace (p. 397). There is a hypermetric line in Jebb's famous Bologna ode,—or was it Abt Vogler?—but I have shewn (l. c.) that the accusation brought against me was a railing accusation. In this case I might have written: Ut <Teuta> gens mortalium—but I have no warrant for 'Teuta' = 'Teutonica' except metrical stress—*ἀνάγκα μετρήθεν*, comp. *ἀνάγκα πατρήθεν* (O. 3, 28)—the same stress that brought about the portentous 'probuerunt' in Professor Postgate's Latin verses published in the Literary Supplement of the Weekly Times (Nov. 8, 1917). 'bobus suis' = 'original research'. Comp. the German student's 'ochsen' = 'to grub'. 'büffeln' is used in the same sense.

B. L. G.

IV.—GREEK INSCRIPTIONS IN THE ROYAL ONTARIO MUSEUM.

[CONCLUDED FROM A. J. P. XXXVIII 311.]

II. Shrine stele of brown sandstone. From Egypt, exact provenience unknown. Height, 0.402 m.; width, 0.342 m.; thickness, 0.032 m. The rectangular plane surface bearing the inscription has been cut into the stone so as to leave at the two sides and across the top as it were a frame about 0.05 m. in width and about 0.0015 m. in relief. Of the two lower corners the right lacks the frame just mentioned and the left has been badly fractured. The inscription consists of nine lines of crude capitals which exhibit an uncial tendency and belong apparently to the first or second century A. D. The work throughout is very poor. The inscription has been marred by long deep diagonal scratches.

ΠΑΠΟΥΣ ΟΙΚΟ
ΔΟΜΗΣΕ ΤΗΝ
ΠΡΟΣΕΥΧΗΝ
ΥΠΕΡ ΑΥΤΟΥ
5 ΚΑΙ ΤΗΣ ΤΥΝ
ΑΙΚΟΣ ΚΑΙ Τ
ΩΝ ΤΕΚΝΩΝ
LΔ ΦΑΡΜΟΥΘΙ

Σ

Παπούς οἶκο|δόμησε τὴν | προσευχὴν | ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ | καὶ τῆς (γ)υν |
αἰκὸς καὶ τῶν τέκνων. | L (= ἔτους) δ (= 4) Φαρμούθι | ζ (= 7).

As we know nothing of the circumstances attending the discovery of this stone, and as the inscription contains no mention of the name of a god, it is impossible for us to determine whether the shrine, or oratory, designated by the stone

was dedicated to the worship of an individual god or to a group of gods; nor can we tell whether it was erected on private property or was one of a number of similar shrines situated in a large sanctuary. It is probably, but not necessarily, non-Christian (see note on *οικοδόμησε*).

Παποῦς: An uncommon Egyptian name attested in Aeg. Urk. aus d. K. Mus. zu Berlin, gr. Urk., I, 153, 5; II, 468, 6; IV, 1067, 1, and perhaps identical with *Παβοῦς* (Grenfell and Hunt, Amherst Pap., Gr., II, ind.), and *Παπεοῦς* (e. g., Grenf., Gr. Pap., 1st ser., 29, 4; Grenf. and H., 2d ser., 25, 4; 35, 8).

οικοδόμησε: So in Bull. de corr. hell., XXVI (1902), p. 448, No. 8; *ἀνοικοδόμησεν* (Breccia, op. cit., 7, p. 51); but *ᾠκοδόμη[σ]εν* (ib., 46, p. 31). Cf. *οικοδόμησαν* in Cagnat and Lafaye, Inscr. Gr. ad res Rom. pertinentes, III, 1127, 4; 1132, 5; 1143, 3; in the ind., p. 674, the authors add "in titulis saepissime". Mayser (Gram. d. gr. Pap. aus d. Ptolemäerzeit) notes three occurrences of failure to augment *οι-* to *ωι-* or *ω-* in the perfect of this verb. Instead of *οικοδομεῖν* we generally find *ποιεῖν*, e. g., *ὑπὲρ βασιλίσσης καὶ βασιλέως θεῶι μεγάλῳ εἰ ωι Ἄλυπ[ος τὴν] προσευχὴν ἐποίει* L i' - *μεχέρ* (on a Jewish shrine stele from Gabbary; Wilamowitz, op. cit., p. 1094). The verb may even be entirely wanting, as in Strack, *Dynastie d. Ptol.*, No. 167 (on a Jewish stele from Athribis).

l. 9: ζ on the stone appears as ξ.

Trans.: Papous erected (this) oratory in behalf of himself and of his wife and of his children. Year 4, Pharaohmouth 7.

III. Funerary stele of white marble. From Egypt, exact provenience unknown. Length 0.272 m., breadth 0.215 m., thickness 0.029 m. Large portions of the upper left hand corner and lower right hand corner have been broken off. The inscription of three lines, however, is intact. It consists of shallowly cut capitals, the work of a professional hand, 0.035 m. in height; they incline to the uncial type, Ε being an excellent example. Epigraphical evidence would lead us to date the inscription in the second or third century A. D. (cf. Larfeld, *Handb. d. gr. Epigr.*, II, pp. 487-501).

ΙΕΡΑΞ
ΑΠΟ ΚΛΕΟΠΑΤΡΙΔΟΣ
L NB ΕΥΨΥΧΙ

Ἰέραξ | ἀπὸ Κλεοπατρίδος. | L (= ἐτῶν) νβ (= 52). Εὐψύ-
χ(ε)ι.

Ἰέραξ: A very common Egyptian name; cf. Milne, *op. cit.*, ind. of personal names, s. v.; Fox, *Mummy-labels in the Royal Ontario Museum*, AJP, xxxiv, 4, pp. 449-50.

ἀπό: As in the mummy-labels, an indication of nativity or of citizenship (Fox, *op. cit.*, p. 442). It appears much more rarely on tombstones; e. g., Σουσάννα θυγάτηρ Ἄννα ἀπὸ Ἰσαυρία (sic) (Lefebvre, *Recueil des inscr. gr. d'Ég.*, 363).

Κλεοπατρίδος: I should be inclined to identify this place with the Cleopatra of Strabo 16, 4, 23: κατὰ Κλεοπατρίδα τὴν πρὸς τῇ παλαιᾷ διώρυγῃ τῇ ἀπὸ τοῦ Νείλου, and 17, 1, 26: πλησίον δὲ τῆς Ἀρσινόης . . . καὶ ἡ Κλεοπατρίς ἐν τῷ μυχῷ τοῦ Ἀραβίου κόλπου τῷ πρὸς Αἴγυπτον. Cf. 17, 1, 25: κατὰ πόλιν Ἀρσινόην ἣν ἔνιοι Κλεοπατρίδα καλοῦσι.

If, however, Κλεοπατρίς is a variant of Κλεοπάτρα (OGIS. 111, n. 8), it may be identical with Κλεοπάτρα of OGIS. 111, 12, or, more probably, with Κλεοπάτρα of the Hermopolite Nome. In nine papyri the name of the latter appears spelt in full (Mitteis, *Gr. Urk. d. Papyrussamml. zu Leipzig*, 18, 7-8; Preisigke, *Gr. Pap. in Strassburg*, 23, 13 a; Th. Reinach, *Pap. gr. et dém. rec. en Ég.*, 10; 14; 16; 21; 22; 23; 31); twice the abbreviation Κλεοπ is counted as standing for this name (Grenfell and Hunt, *Amherst Pap.*, Gr., II, 126, 42; Wessely, *Stud. z. Pal. und Papyrusk.*, Corp. Pap. Hermopol., pt. 1, 127 F 1); the ethnic Κλεοπατρεὺς is once recorded. The κρήνη Κλεοπατρ(ε)ίου mentioned in the *Cat. of Pap. in Brit. Mus.*, III, 182, is hesitatingly located by the editor in Hermopolis.

Εὐψύχ(ε)ι: A spelling commonly found on Egyptian funerary stelae, as Milne, *op. cit.*, 9226; 9250; 27532; 27565; 27630; Lefebvre, *op. cit.*, 36. For ι = ε see Mayser, *op. cit.*, pp. 87-88; Fox, *op. cit.*, p. 439.

IV. Stele of brown sandstone, probably superimposed upon a lintel and perhaps dedicatory in character. From Deir el-Bahari in the Thebaïd. A regular rectangle 0.295 m. in height,

0.392 m. in breadth, and 0.077-0.13 m. in thickness. All four corners have suffered from abrasions. The stone is ornamented with an incised line which passes about the rectangle three or four cm. from the edge and thus forms a sort of frame. The upper third of the space within the frame is a plane surface bearing a Greek inscription of two lines. The lower two-thirds is a sunken rectangular panel adorned with sacred Christian symbols in relief. In the centre is a variant of the Christus-symbol \dagger in which the Greek cross, two or three cm. in width, is presented in simple outline; the symbol is entirely surrounded by a wreath of palm leaves. The upper part of the space at the left of the wreath is occupied by an Λ , and the lower part by an "ankh" cross or *crux ansata* (φ); the corresponding positions at the right are occupied by an ω and another *crux ansata* whose circle was left unfinished by the stone-cutter. The workmanship of the stone, while much superior to that of our other inscriptions except No. I, is only fair. The letters of the text are about three cm. in height and are mixed square and uncial. All but three or four present no difficulties in reading.

EIE ΘΕΟΙ Ο ΒΟΗ . ΟΝ
ΤΩ ΜΟΝΑΕΤΗΡΙΩ ΔΑΜΗΝ

Εἰς θεὸς ὁ βοη[θ]ῶν | τῷ(ι) μοναστηρίῳ(ι). Ἀμήν.

Εἰς βοηθῶν: For the same phrase, its significance and spelling, see n. on VI. On the wall of the third terrace at Deir el-Bahari a graffito of allied nature has been discovered: Εἰς θεὸς ὁ βοηθῶν ὑμῶν (= ἡμῶν) (Lefebvre, op. cit., 379; Peer, Jour. Hell. Stud., XIX, 1899, pp. 14-19) followed by an "ankh" cross with palms; also one at Deir el-Chohada in the Convent of the Martyrs (Lefebvre, op. cit., 539); four on the walls of a Coptic monastery near Esnah in Southern Egypt (CIG, IV, 8946, 1-4); cf. ib., 9154 from the ruins of a Syrian monastery, and Lefebvre, op. cit., 415, on the funerary stele of an Egyptian monk.

Τῷ(ι) μοναστηρίῳ(ι): The dative generally follows the foregoing phrase, but often the genitive, as in Lefebvre, op. cit., 379, quoted in the previous note. A close parallel is furnished by a Syrian inscription which my former colleague, Professor

David Magie, brought to my attention: ὡ θεὸς τοῦ ἀγ[ί]ου Σεργ[ίου] | κὲ Βάχου, εὐλόγησον τοῦ μονηστ(ηρίου). This inscription has since been edited in Publ. Princeton Archaeol. Exped. Syria, Gr. and Lat. ISS, A, where it appears as No. 722.

Ἀμήν: Exceedingly common in Crum, Cat. gén. des ant. ég. du Mus. du Caire, Coptic Monuments, and in Lefebvre, op. cit.

The symbols of the lower panel are of prime value in determining the age of this inscription. Lefebvre states (op. cit., p. xxxii) that inscriptions bearing A and Ω may possibly belong to the fourth century, but probably belong to a later one. There is nothing certain in regard to the age of the sign † except that it is younger than ✕ (and ✕), which are apparently to be assigned to the fourth century (p. xxxiv). The indications are, therefore, that an inscription marked by this sign originated during the fifth or a subsequent century. The *crux ansata* is a very ancient pre-Christian symbol found commonly in Egypt and other oriental lands. It was early appropriated by the Christians along with its pagan meaning of "life". None of the many attempts to explain the symbolism of the constituent parts can be regarded as conclusive (Seymour, *The Cross in Tradition, History and Art*, pp. 3-5; 7; 16-17; 21; 188; Zoeckler, *The Cross of Christ*, pp. 2 ff.; 156; 379 ff.; cf. Flinders Petrie, *Eg. Decor. Art*, p. 117).

The name Deir el-Bahari means "The Northern Monastery", although at present no monastery exists on the site. But as "deir" may be applied also to a place where such a building once stood (Somers Clarke, *Christian Ant. in the Nile Valley*, p. 192), it is quite properly used in this instance, for in the early part of the Christian era a monastery was erected here on the ruins of the old dynastic temple of Hatshepsut (see Naville, Hall, Currelly, *The XIth Dynasty Temple at Deir el-Bahari*, pt. iii, p. 20). Hall (ib., p. 13) without qualification identifies this as the Coptic monastery of St. Phoebammon. Amélineau (*La Géographie de l'Égypte à l'époque copte*, p. 128), on the other hand, merely conjectures this identification. The documentary evidence at his disposal seems to justify his conclusion (cf. Crum, op. cit., 8728-8741). If it is correct, this old monastery sheltered a large community of monks, for we are told that it had a superior and at least one steward, and perhaps two. It enjoyed marked distinc-

tion in the surrounding region through the fame of its patron Phoebammon, bishop of Aousim (Amélineau, *op. cit.*, p. 129). How late the building stood is not recorded. At all events, no document dating later than the eighth century has been recovered from the heaps of rubbish thrown out by the monks (Naville, Hall, Currelly, *op. cit.*, p. 21). Clarke (*op. cit.*, p. 190) notes that some remains of the monastery "encrusted" the temple of Hatshepsut during the incumbency of a recent director-general of antiquities, and holds this official responsible for their destruction and for failure to secure beforehand plans and records of them.

There is no evidence offered by the chief authorities (Butler, *The Ancient Coptic Churches of Egypt*; Clarke, *op. cit.*,) on Coptic ecclesiastical procedure that it was the custom to lay a stone of dedication in erecting a church or monastery. But in the consecration of an altar three dedicatory stones were used, each bearing the name of one of the three patron saints of the building (Clarke, *op. cit.*, p. 192). The stone now being edited is therefore not an altar stone, and we are probably safe in inferring from the silence of the authorities that it is not a stone of dedication of the building as a whole. The fact (see No. VI, n.) that in Syria the phrase *ἐς θεός* (as well as its amplifications) appears most frequently over lintels suggests that this stone occupied some such position in the monastery of Deir el-Bahari. A funerary stele (Lefebvre, *op. cit.*, 364) from Thebes, in the environs of which our inscription originated, is constructed in the form of the portal of a church and is inscribed with the sacred phrase. The association of the words with an entrance was therefore known in this locality. It is not improbable that a lintel thus inscribed had some secondary connection with the dedication of a building. The dimensions of the Toronto stone are such as to induce one to infer that it was incorporated into the original walls of the monastery and was not an appliqué of later date.

No conclusive evidence is available for identifying and dating St. Phoebammon. He may be the man of that name mentioned in the 143rd epistle of Synesius. The life of the latter extended from about 370 to 415 A. D. (Schneider, *De Vita Syn. Philosophi et Episcopi*, diss., Leipzig, 1876, pp. 9, 41 ff.). The epistle to which we have alluded was written

during the last few years of his life and at that time Phoebammon¹ was still living. This date approximates that deduced in the examination of the chronological indications of the symbols on the stone. An object, we observed, bearing the symbol ⚡ can scarcely be older than the fifth century. This stone may possibly be more recent in its origin, but the fair degree of excellence in the execution of its adornments argues against such a supposition.

V. Funerary stele of limestone. From Egypt, exact provenience unknown. Height 0.573 m.; width 0.47 m.; thickness 0.077 m. The stele is rectangular and on it is represented a distyle portico with an angular pediment surmounted by acroteria. The two columns have the so-called papyrus capitals. The entire breadth of the lower part of the area between the columns is occupied by a couch on which a male figure is reclining on his left side. His left elbow rests on two cushions and his head is turned so as to face the observer. He is clad in chiton and himation, below which appear his unsandaled feet. In his extended right hand he is holding a cyathus before a jackal. The animal is lying on a bracket or corbel projecting from the background and faces the front. The whole work is in moderately high relief. The nose of the man and that of the jackal have been badly mutilated. The cyathus, originally represented in relief on the bracket, has almost entirely vanished. The workmanship throughout is very crude.

On the horizontal panel between the legs of the couch are sketched in roughly incised outline four domestic utensils of the Roman period. Enumerating from right to left these are: a bowl with a high foot, an amphora with a pointed base supported on a tripod, a three-legged pot with a sparingly ornamented body, and, lastly, another bowl.

Illustrations and descriptions of very similar monuments may be seen in Milne, *op. cit.*, 9258 (pl. viii); 9251 and 9256 (pl. ix). The chief variable in this type of sculpture is the figure of the jackal. As a rule it rests on a bracket attached to one of the pillars. Often two jackals appear one on each side of the portico. This animal had an important religious

¹ An undated Coptic tombstone (No. 10. 176. 40) in the Metr. Mus. in New York, bears the name Φοιβάμ(μ)ων.

significance for the Egyptian, who believed that a soul on leaving the dead body had to pass through the great wilderness before it could reach the oasis-kingdom of Osiris. "The jackal's omniscience as to where any dead body is hidden, his wail in the night as if for lost souls, his certainty of direction out in the limitless, trackless, demonic desert, and the fact that though his home is the desert, yet he is never far from an oasis, made this animal the best possible symbol of a guide for the dead." (The Sacred Ibis Cemetery and Jackal Catacombs at Abydos, *The Nat. Geog. Magazine*, XXIV (1913), 9, pp. 1048-1050.)

On the horizontal panel below the portico is an inscription of four lines. Only the first two are at all difficult to read and they were apparently inscribed after the last two which identify the remains marked by the stone. At all events they were cut by another and less skilful hand. In view of this and of the uncertainty conveyed by the $\omega\varsigma$ ($\epsilon\tau\omega\nu$) as to the exact age of the defunct, we may conclude: either that his exact age was unknown, or that, in the daily expectation of his death, friends prepared and inscribed the stone with all particulars but the date of decease. Below the two lines of the first hand are scored deep guide-lines. The epigraphical indications point to the first or second century as the period to which this monument belongs. The letters approximate the uncial of the manuscripts more nearly than those of No. III.

Ε . Ο . C K

X O I A K κ̄ε

ΠΤΟΛΛΙΩΝ ΕΥΑΝΓ . ΛΟΥ ΙΜ . . Ι Ο

ΠΩΛΗC ΕΥCΕΒΗC ΩC LL ΠΒ

*Ε[τ]ο[υ]ς κ' | , Χοίακ κ̄ε. | Πτολλίων Εὐανγ[έ]λου
 ἱμ[ατ]ιο | πώλης, εὐσεβής. ὥς LL (= $\epsilon\tau\omega\nu$) πβ (=82).

Πτολλίων: An Egyptian name recorded in a few places only: e. g., Grenfell and Hunt, *Ox. Pap.*, I, 72; 137; II, 274; IV, 492; Mitteis, *op. cit.*, 104 (Πτολίων); *Cat. of Gr. Pap. in Brit. Mus.*, II, ind.; *Aeg. Urk.*, gr. *Urk.*, I, 68 (Πτολλείων).

Εὐανγ[έ]λου: A good Greek name attested as early as the sixth century B. C. (see Kirchner, *Pros. Att.*, and Pape, *Gr.*

Eigenn., s. v.). This origin of the name and the pagan symbolism of the monument proves that the use of the name here is not due to Christian influences. For other records of the name in Egypt see Aeg. Urk., gr. Urk., II, III, IV, ind., and Grenfell and Hunt, Ox. Pap., VI, 989, where the correct spelling is observed throughout. Of the use of -γγ- for -γγ- in cognate words abundant parallels are to be had by consulting the index of the works of Prentice, and of Cagnat and Lafaye, already noted, and also of Audollent, *Defixionum Tabellae* (Paris, 1904).

ιμ[ατ]ιωπάλης: So in a mummy-label in Cairo (Milne, op. cit., 9311). Whether ο or ω is to be read before π is not clear on the stone.

εὔσεβης: Cf. Δουπ<π>ιανή ἄυρος φιλάδελφος εὔσεβῆ(ς), ὡς ἐτῶν L (sic) κδ', ἔτους κβ', 'Αθῶρ κβ' (Milne, op. cit., 9226).

LL: Usually a single L suffices for both ἔτους and ἐτῶν.

Trans.: Year 20, Choiak 25. Ptolion (son) of Evangelus, clothing merchant, (died) in the faith at about the age of eighty-two.

VI. Greek-Coptic funerary stele of limestone. From Egypt, exact provenience unknown, but probably from the Fayûm to which district Lefebvre (op. cit., p. xxvii) attributes all Christian inscriptions on limestone. Height, 0.337 m.; width, 0.266 m.; thickness, 0.046 m. The stele is a perfect rectangle except for the loss of a small part of the upper right hand corner. A cross *fleury* in shallow intaglio outlines almost covers the surface of the stone symmetrically. The bar and pale of the cross, which are almost uniformly 0.029 m. in width, intersect one another approximately at their medial points. A semicircle of the same width unites the ends of the bar with the top end of the pale. From each side of the semicircle a half-opened leaf-bud rises towards the corner of the stone nearest to it. From the under sides of the semicircle hang two fully-opened vine leaves on long sinuous stems. Below the bar is a Greek-Coptic inscription of three lines, the letters of which show marked uncial characteristics. Below this again are illegible traces of another inscription of equal length. Inasmuch as the text now legible is complete in itself it seems probable that the stone was originally erected to mark the grave of some other personage than the Petros

noted here, and that this man or his friends appropriated the stone, erased the original legend, and inscribed the present one.

Ε Ι C Θ .

H Θ N +

Π Ε Τ Ρ Ο V

O C O B O ,

P H N Ε ¹Λ


Ε Τ Ο V A A B


Els θ[ε]ός ὁ βο | ηθὼν Χρ(ιστός). HNE ¹M | ΠΕΤΡΟV
ΕΤΟVΑΑΒ.

Els βοηθὼν: Cf. No. IV. Els θεός either alone or with μόνος or ὁ βοηθῶν is very common in the Egyptian compilations of Crum and of Lefebvre. Prentice (op. cit.) records it often in Syrian inscriptions and explains (pp. 51 ff.) that although it is of Jewish origin it is Christian in its sphere of usage. It seems to be a transcript of a portion of Deut. VI, 4, and in accordance with the prescription of v. 9 of the same chapter is generally found inscribed over entrance doors. In Syria the formula is observed throughout a period ranging from 326 to 537 A. D.

βοηθὼν: For this spelling see Crum (op. cit.) and Lefebvre (op. cit.) passim. o for ω in vulgar inscriptions from Egypt is one of the commonest faults of orthography which go to make up "cet amas de bizarreries qui s'expliquent plus par le caprice et l'ignorance individuelle, que par les lois naturelles d'une langue en voie de transformation" (Lefebvre, op. cit., p. xxxviii). Cf. Mayser, op. cit., p. 98.

+P = Χρ(ιστός): The loop of the ρ has disappeared through a chipping off of the stone, but the reading is made certain by comparing it with the very similar text of an unpublished Greek-Coptic inscription (No. 10. 176. 24) in the Metropolitan Museum, New York.

HNE: Professor R. D. Wilson of the Princeton Theological Seminary writes me that this word (HNH, in the Metropolitan inscription just referred to) is a corruption of ΕΙΝΕ (=Abbild, Gestalt, in Steindorff, Kopt. Gram., p. 68*, s. v.), which is probably identical with INI of Deut. IV, 32 (=Hebr.  and LXX. γλυπτόν) and connected with the Egyptian

 = 'in. The word occurs nowhere in Crum, op. cit. Ordinarily the Coptic uses one or other of the Greek loan-words CTHH and MNHMEION, if the word for monument is required at all.

ΜΠΕΤΡΟΥ: $\overline{M} = \overline{N}$, the particle uniting the nomen rectum and the nomen regens (Steindorff, op. cit., pp. 21, 70). The genitive idea involved here accounts for the employment of the Greek genitive ending of ΠΕΤΡΟΥ. This name is noted also in Crum, op. cit., 8670.

ΕΤΟΝΑΑΒ: =ΕΤ+ΟΝΑΑΒ, i. e., the relative particle (Steindorff, op. cit., p. 203) plus the participle of the infinitive ΟΥΟΠ, "rein, heilig werden" (pp. 93; 83*). The expression is counted only three times in Crum's Coptic Mon.; Εἰς θεὸς ὁ βοηθῶν ΟΦΙΑ ΤΜΟΝΟΧΗ ΤΠΑΡΘΕΝΟC ΕΤΟΝΑΑΒ 'ΑΜΗΝ (8651); also 8492; 8578; and once in an unpublished inscription (No. 10. 176. 37) in the Metropolitan Museum, New York.

The entire Coptic phrase signifies: The stele of Peter who is pure (i. e., probably, celibate).

"The cross *fleury* is the earliest variation of the cross. It appears on coins of the Emperor Justinian" (Seymour, op. cit., p. 367). The full-blown petals at the ends of the bar and of the pale symbolize the mature Christian life. The budding and the unfolded leaves tell much the same story, but emphasize the progress towards this maturity rather than the attainment itself. This inscription bearing as it does this type of cross cannot well be older than the middle of the sixth century.

VII. Iron knife from the Fayûm. Blade and handle-band of one piece 0.275 m. long; blade alone c. 0.067 m. wide. The metal is badly rusted. Cylindrical handle of wood 0.121 m. long; c. 0.056 m. in diameter. Around the handle are scored a number of parallel rings. The name +ΑΤΕ is incised on the

left side of the blade. No similarly inscribed knife is listed by Milne (op. cit., pp. 105 ff.) among the many Egyptian domestic objects preserved in the Museum of Cairo.

Ψάτε: A Greek-Coptic name found in a few late documents; e. g., Cat. of Gr. Pap. in the Brit. Mus., IV (= Aphrodito Pap.), 1460, 101; 1553, verso 25; Crum, op. cit., 8212; 8268; 8270; 8276.

A common variant is Ψότε, as Aphrod. Pap., 1419, 197, 1274; 1457, 11. Ψοτ and Ψατ appear as abbreviations (ib., 1491 d; 1460, 176). Ψότι (Reich, Dem. und gr. Texte auf Mumientäfelchen in d. Samml. d. Pap. Erzherzog Rainer, Gr. 4), and Ψάτης (Lefebvre, op. cit., 266) seem to be a Demotic and a Hellenized variant respectively.

VIII. Votive inscription of the type of προσκύνημα, or supplication, on a layer of a crystal of gypsum. From Egypt, exact provenience unknown. Originally a rectangle, but now an irregular quadrilateral figure owing to the loss of a portion of the top and of one side. Perpendicular height, 0.061 m.; width, 0.59 m.; thickness, 0.003 m. Inasmuch as the crystal is snow-white and as the letters are lightly incised, the resulting lack of contrast makes the inscription unusually hard to read. The two surfaces are written upon, but each by a different hand and in the free cursive style of the first century A. D.

A

Only one line, or, at the most, two lines, have been lost at the top, and only several letters at the right.

- [τὸ προσκύνημα]
[ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ καὶ]
1. [τῆς γυν]αικ[ὸς
καὶ τῶν φίλων
μου καὶ Ἀρνω
τον. γέγραφε
5. ταῦτα
— ἱ Νέρων[ος τοῦ
κυρίου Με[χείρ or Μεσορῆ
μ[ηνός . . .

For the best examples of this type of inscription beginning with the words τὸ προσκύνημα, see CIG, III, 4985 ff., passim.

Cf. Bull. de corr. hell., XXVI (1902), pp. 442-3, Nos. 2, 3. To know the name of the deity in whose shrine this crystal and No. IX were picked up would materially assist in the restoration of the text.

[αὐτοῦ] : = ἐμαντοῦ, as often in this department.

Ἀρνώτον : = Ἀρνώτου. Spiegelberg, Aeg. und gr. Eigenn. aus Mumienetiketten, p. 6*, states that the name means "Horus ist gesund"; cf. Fox, op. cit., p. 446. The rough breathing was written here as ὁ.

γέγραφα : So in CIG, 333, 4742; often ἔγραψα, ἐπόησα, πέπνηκα.

L : = ἔτους.

Trans.: Supplication in behalf of myself and of my wife and of my friends and of Haryotes. I have written this in the tenth year of our Lord Nero, in the month Mecheir (or Mesore) (= Jan.-Feb. or July-Aug., 64 A. D.).

B

One or two lines are missing at the beginning and a few syllables at the left side. The right is practically intact.

[τὸ προσκύνημα]

- I.]ο[καὶ]
 τοῦ υἱοῦ α[ὐ
 το]ῦ καὶ τῶν
 αὐ]τοῦ πάντω
 ¹
 5. ν. L _ι]β Νέρωνος
 τοῦ] κυρίου,
 Παχ]ῶν ἰδ

5: The stroke above the figure β̄ is plainly continued unbroken from the left. This naturally prompts one to supply another figure. As A was inscribed in the tenth year of Nero, the interval between the two compositions on the one object would be too long were any other figure than ἰ supplied.

Trans.: Supplication of (or, in behalf of) and of his son and of all his household. Year twelve of our Lord Nero, Pachon 14 (= May 9, 66 A. D.).

IX. Similar to No. VIII. A parallelogram; perpendicular height, 0.057 m.; width, 0.045 m.; thickness, c. 0.002 m. The writing is of the same type and period as that on No. VIII, but is much fainter and more poorly executed. Not more than a dozen letters can be deciphered with certainty. Any restoration, therefore, must be regarded as tentative. The indications point to a longer and more complex formula than those of No. VIII. With the restoration appended hereto cf. *en bloc* CIG, III, 4986 ff.

- [τὸ προσκύνημα praeominis]
 1.]λιου λουπο[
]π[α]ρα τη(ι) κυρι[α(ι)
 [nomini deae ὑπὲρ τῆς γυν[αικ]ῶς καὶ
 τῆς θυ]γατρὸς καὶ τῶ[ν
 5. φίλων πάν]των μου [καὶ
 Δ]ημητρί[ου . L . .]
 Νέρω]νος τοῦ κυ[ρίου,
 κῆ [Πα]χ[ών, or Με]χ[είρ.

]λιου λουπο[: Probably a nomen and a cognomen like Cornelius Lupus in the genitive.

παρά: Cf. CIG, III, 4839; 4897; 4902.

μου: Cf. CIG, III, 4996.

κῆ: The letter read here as κ resembles λ on the crystal, but that is of course impossible either as a day of the month or as a year of Nero's reign. We assume that the number of the year preceded the emperor's name as on both faces of No. VIII. The year in this case can hardly be far from the tenth and twelfth of Nero's reign.

W. SHERWOOD FOX.

WESTERN UNIVERSITY, LONDON, CANADA.

V.—REDUPLICATION IN TAGALOG.

Reduplication is a common linguistic phenomenon, consisting of the repetition of the whole or part of a word, which is found to a certain extent in probably all languages. In many it has failed to be adopted as a part of the machinery or grammar of the language, and is of little or no importance; in others it has become a part of the bone and sinew of the language, and has given rise to many important categories. Nowhere, perhaps, is this linguistic principle more productive of results than in the Philippine languages, and here it probably finds its highest development in Tagalog, the most important language of the archipelago.

Reduplication in Tagalog may be of one or more syllables, and it may be at the beginning or end of a word. The final consonant of a syllable that is reduplicated is not repeated unless it is the final consonant of a word or root.

With regard to form the following are the principal varieties of reduplication, viz.,

1) monosyllabic, where a single syllable is reduplicated to form a root, e. g., *olól* 'mad'.¹

2) partial, where one syllable near the beginning of a word is reduplicated, the syllable being either the first syllable of a root or one of the syllables of a prefix, e. g.,

susúlat from *súlat* 'write'.

magkaka-útang from *magka-útang* 'owe'.

magigin-banál from *magin-banál* 'become good'.

3) full, in which the first two syllables of a word or root are repeated, e. g.,

araw'araw from *araw* 'day'.

sangposangpówo from *sangpówo* 'ten'.

¹ In the various Spanish grammars the accent marks are used to denote both the tonic syllable and the final glottal catch, but without

- 4) combined partial and full, e. g.,

iisaisá from *isá* 'one'.

babalibaligtád from *baligtád* 'turn'.

- 5) reduplication of the final syllable, e. g.,

bulaklák 'flower' from **bulak*.

himaymáy 'separate meat from bones' from *himay* (same).

- 6) final reduplication which consists in adding at the end of a dissyllabic word a syllable consisting of the initial consonant of the first syllable and the vowel and final consonant of the last syllable, e. g.,

kaliskís 'scale (of fish)' from *kalís* 'to scrape'.

Reduplication may be either significant or non-significant, i. e., non-significant in the sense that its significance is not apparent, or that no special semantic category arises from the reduplication, though in every case there was doubtless a reason for the reduplication.

Classes (1), (5) and (6) are always non-significant; partial reduplication (2) is non-significant in the following cases, viz.,

- a) in certain nouns simple and derivative, e. g.,

laláki 'man'.¹

babáyi 'woman'.

masasaktín 'sickly'.

inaamá 'god-father'.

- b) in the numerals:

daławá (< **dadawa*) 'two'.²

tatló 'three'.

uniformity or consistency. The following system based partly on their usage is here employed, viz.,

á = accent on either penult or ultima.

à = glottal catch on final unaccented vowel.

â = accented final vowel with glottal catch.

¹ Here, for instance, the reduplication may be used to emphasize the strength or size of the male (*lakí* means 'greatness, size'). The following word *babáyi* 'woman' may owe its reduplication to analogy with this word.

² Here the reduplication may be due to the idea of doubling and in the following word it may be analogical.

c) in roots of the *magkan* verbal class, which indicates 'to emit from body voluntarily', e. g.,

magkanlulúhà 'to weep (modal)'.

Significant reduplication, generally speaking, emphasizes or strengthens in some way the meaning of the simple word. The various significant uses of reduplication are the following.

Partial reduplication (2) indicates emphasis, intensiveness, or plurality in the following cases, viz.:

a) adjectives with prefixed *ma* form their plural thus, e. g., *mabubúti* from *mabúti* 'good'.

b) adjectives of equality denoting 'as much of the quality as', take this form of reduplication when more than two individuals are compared, e. g., *magkalakí*, *singlakí*, *magkasinglakí* 'as large as'; *magkakalakí*, *singlalakí*, *magkakasinglakí*, 'equally large'.

c) the words *kauntí* 'a little', *muntí* 'a little, small', make the forms *kakauntí*, *mumuntí*, which are usually employed as plurals.

d) nouns of relationship with prefixed *mag*, e. g., *magamá* 'father and child' take this form of reduplication to denote a group of three or more, e. g., *magaamá* 'father and children'.

e) the exclamatory expressions formed of abstract noun + genitive with the meaning of how + predicate adjective + subject, e. g., *búti niyá* 'how beautiful she is!' (literally 'beauty of her!') may have their meaning intensified by this form of reduplication, which is used especially when the genitive is plural, e. g., *bubúti niyá* 'how beautiful she is!!' *bubúti nilá* 'how beautiful they are!!'

f) with numerals and names of pieces of money this reduplication emphasizes the meaning of the numerals in a restrictive sense, e. g., *iisá* 'only one' from *isá* 'one', *titigalawá* 'only two apiece' from *tigalawá* 'two apiece', *miminsan* 'only once' from *minsan* 'once', *pipiso* 'only one peso' from *piso* 'peso'.

g) a similar restrictive reduplication is found in nouns of individuality with prefixed *ka*, e. g., *katáwo* 'one man', *kakatáwo* 'one man only'.

h) in the regular verbal forms this kind of reduplication indicates intensity in time, e. g., from the root *larô* 'play' we have

naglalarô present from *naglarô* preterite, and *maglalarô* future from *maglarô* modal; the same reduplication is found in most verbal nouns of action, e. g., *paglalarô* 'act of playing'.

i) intensive active imperatives are formed by prefixing *ka* to the partially reduplicated root, e. g., *kalalákad* 'go quickly'.

j) the same formation as in (i) is used as a passive verbal form in the sense of 'to have just', e. g., *kaaalis niyá* 'he has just gone' from *alis* 'go'.

k) the oblique case of the article, *sa*, followed by a partially reduplicated noun or root is said to indicate that something has been done which is displeasing to the speaker, e. g., *sa titinḡin ka* 'you kept on looking : ' here the force of the reduplication is probably to emphasize the incontrovertibility of the statement as in 'you did, you know you did, you needn't deny it'.

In (a), (b), (c), (d), (e) the reduplication usually denotes plurality, though at times it intensifies some idea other than number; in (f), (g) it emphasizes the idea of individuality or number; in (h), (i), (j) it indicates additional vividness in time relations; in (k) it emphasizes the incontrovertibility of the statement.

Partial reduplication (2) denotes distribution in,

a) the distributive numerals with prefixed *tig* from 'five' upward, e. g., *tiglimá* 'five each' from *limá* 'five'.

b) nouns derived from names of money with the suffix *in*, e. g., *sasalapin* 'having value of a *salapí* each', from *salapí* 'half-peso'.

c) *magkakanó* 'how much apiece' from *magkanó* 'how much'.

d) perhaps in cardinal numeral adverbs above 'five', e. g., *makalimá* or *makalilimá* 'five times' from *limá* 'five'; the reduplicated forms probably meant originally 'five several times', etc.

Full reduplication (3) indicates emphasis, intensiveness or plurality in the following cases, viz.:

a) the pronoun of the third person plural may take this reduplication, e. g., *silasilá*, *kanikanilá*, as well as *silá*, *kanilá*.

b) the plural of interrogative pronouns is made in the same way, e. g., *sinosino*, from *sino* 'who', *alinalin* from *alín* 'which', *anoanó* from *anó* 'what'.

c) a general intensive idea is given by full reduplication of the root either in root or derivative abstract nouns, e. g., *mulamulâ* 'the very beginning', *karunungrunúnġan* 'knowledge', *pagkábutibúti* 'beauty' (in exclamations).

d) adjectives indicating qualities that affect the mind are made by prefixing *ka* to the fully reduplicated root, e. g., *kaibigibig* 'lovable'.

e) the superlative of adjectives is in form at least an abstract noun with fully reduplicated root, e. g., *katam'istam'isan* 'sweetest' from *ma-tam'is* 'sweet'.

f) certain adverbs have their meaning emphasized by this form of reduplication, e. g., *kanġikanġina* 'just a moment ago', *sa magkabikabilâ* 'from all sides'.

g) verbs made on the basis of fully reduplicated roots may have an intensive meaning, e. g., *magkasirasirâ* 'to be completely destroyed'.

h) the particle *ka* prefixed to fully reduplicated verbal roots or passive stems imparts the idea of 'as soon as', e. g., *katakbotakbô niyâ* 'as soon as he began to run'.

In (b) the reduplication usually, though not necessarily, indicates the plural, in (c) the nouns are often used in connection with a plural genitive, in (h) it denotes additional vividness in time relations, in (e) it indicates the superlative, otherwise it is simply intensive.

Full reduplication denotes distribution in the following cases, viz.:

a) with root nouns it has the force of 'every', e. g., *ta-wotâwo* 'every man', *araw'araw* 'every day'.

b) the numerals *tigatlô*, *tigápat*, 'three apiece', 'four apiece', have also the reduplicated forms *tigatigatlô*, *tigatigápat*.

c) regular series of distributive numerals meaning 'so many at a time', and 'every so many' are derived from the cardinal and ordinal numerals respectively, e. g., *daladalawâ* 'two by two', from *dalawâ* 'two', *ikaikatlô* 'every third' from *ikatlô*.

d) in certain adverbs, e. g., *untí'untí* 'little by little'.

Occasionally this form of reduplication has the force of 'various' or 'some', e. g., *bagaybagáy* 'things of various kinds', *maminsanmínsan* 'sometimes'.

This form of reduplication has also developed a peculiar diminutive force in the following, viz.:

a) in nouns with suffix *an*, e. g., *tawotawóhan* 'manikin' from *táwo* 'man'.

b) in adjectives with prefix *ma*, e. g., *mabutibúti* 'somewhat good, pretty good' from *mabúti* 'good'.

c) in verbs, e. g., *sumusulatsúlat* 'he writes a little' from *sumusúlat* 'he writes'; these diminutive verbal forms are said to differ from the emphatic reduplicated verbal forms like *magkasirasirá* 'to be completely destroyed' (cf. above, p. 429) in their intonation.

Combined reduplication (4) regularly indicates a greater degree of restriction than that implied by (2) in

a) restrictive numerals and names of money, e. g., *iisaisá* 'one only' from *iisá*, *pipisopiso* 'only a single *piso*', from *pipiso*.

b) nouns of individuality with prefixed *ka*, e. g., *kakatakátáwo* 'one man only' from *katáwo*.

Various combinations of the different kinds of reduplication also occur in which each kind has its own special force, e. g., *natotoyotoyô* present of *matoyotoyô* 'be very dry', where we have partial reduplication indicating the present, with intensive full reduplication, etc.

The most original form of reduplication in Tagalog seems to have been the repetition of a monosyllabic or a dissyllabic root. This combination had originally two meanings, one intensive as in *mulamulâ* 'the very beginning' from *mulâ* 'root, beginning', and the other extensive, e. g., *tawotáwo* 'one man, another man (and so on)', i. e., 'every man'.¹ Partial reduplication either at the beginning or end of a word is probably to be regarded as originally a substitute for full reduplication. From these simple beginnings, through the influence of analogy, the complicated system which has just been outlined has been developed. From intensive reduplication are derived all forms that denote simple emphasis, plurality, the superlative, additional vividness in time relations, and restriction;

¹ Evidences of this double meaning of reduplication are found also in Semitic; cf. my article, The Expression of Indefinite Pronominal Ideas in Hebrew, *Journal of American Oriental Society*, Vol. XXXIV, parts I and II (1914), p. 140, n. 3.

from extensive reduplication, all forms that denote distribution, whether it has the meaning of 'so many at a time', 'so many to each', 'every so many', 'of various sorts', 'some'. Reduplication that has a diminutive force is perhaps derived from the intensive reduplication of some word denoting 'little' or the like, e. g., *mumuntî*, from which it was extended to other words with the diminutive force still adhering to it.¹

FRANK R. BLAKE.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

¹ Reduplication with a similar diminutive force is occasionally found in Sanskrit adjectives, e. g., *kṣāmakṣāma* 'rather thin' from *kṣāma* 'thin' (cf. Speier, *Sanskrit Syntax*, Leyden, 1886, p. 191); and also in certain color words in Hebrew, e. g., *adamdamet* 'reddish' from *adom* 'red' (cf. Gesenius-Kautzsch, *Hebrew Grammar*, 2d Eng. ed., p. 235, §84, n).

VI.—SLAVIC *togo*.

In a recent article, *Mém. Soc. Ling.* XIX 115 ff., Meillet deals with the pronunciation of the Russian pronominal ending -ГО (*togo, kogo, čego, dobrogo*, etc.) as -vo, in which *v* is clearly substituted for *γ*. He refutes Fortunatov's view, according to which Sl. *togo* comes from I. E. **toyo* (**tojo*) = Gr. *τόο, τοῦ* (Homeric *τοῖο*), and derives *tavó* < **toyó* from a form with I. E. *gh*, following the traditional view in this respect. The intervocalic voiced stop *g* in *togo* became a spirant, *γ*, on account of the frequent unemphatic use of *mots accessoires* like *togo*. But since the voiced velar spirant otherwise hardly occurs in (standard) Russian, the more familiar labio-dental spirant *v* was substituted for it. Concerning this substitution, there can be no doubt, either as to the fact itself, or as to the reason for it. The change *g* > *γ* is more doubtful. Theoretically, it is, of course, quite possible; but there are no reliable parallels to be found in Great Russian, with the exception of the southern dialects, where this change is common. The spirantic pronunciation of *g* in *boga* is due to the church language, in which southern influence prevails to an extent, while *γ* in *togda, kogda* is due either to the association with *togo, kogo*, or to dissimilation in the unusual sound combination *gd*—probably both factors have contributed. No such reasons are imaginable for the ending -go. Form words of the kind of *togo* are not likely to introduce a foreign sound into the language; on the other hand, they are now and then found to preserve older pronunciations under conditions such as I outlined JEGPh. XVI 5 f.; thus, *d* was retained instead of the newer *t* in Gothic *du, dis*-, *g* for *k* in Runic *haitega*, *t* for *z* in Middle Franconian *that, it, wat, allet*. It is most likely that the spirant in the Russian forms in question presents a similar inhibited development, namely a primitive Slavic *γ*, which fell together with Sl. *g* < I. E. *g* or *gh* in all other Slavic languages, but retained its spirantic

character in Russian under conditions exactly analogous to those of MFr. *that*, etc. In other words, I consider the Russian pronominal genitives in *-go* = *-vo* as *Restwörter* (cp. Hermann, KZ. XXXIX 609), in which a phonetic change that affected all of the rest of the language was not carried thru. If so, the present pronunciation of *boga* was introduced while *togo* was pronounced *toyó*; the unusual velar spirant was retained in the church word, but replaced by familiar *v* in the form words.

But what was the origin of that *γ*? It seems chronologically improbable that it preserved a prehistoric difference between I. E. *g* and *gh*, which fell together in primitive Slavic times. Still, this would have to be assumed if we accept the traditional explanation dating back to Miklosich, that Sl. *-go* represents an I. E. particle **gho* = Skr. *gha*. Fortunatov, BB. XX 182 doubts this explanation, and also Berneker, KZ. XXXVII 374 believes "dass die Erklärung von *-go* als Partikel gleich ai. *gha* ihre Bedenken hat". But Meillet, *Du genre animé en vieux-slave*, p. 114 ff. (with Jagić, ASPH. I 440) explains *togo* as an ablative, I. E. **tōd* = Lith. *tō*, Skr. *tāt*, combined with the particle **gho*; Sl. **ta-go* became *togo* under the influence of forms like *tomu*.

A different explanation of these forms had been briefly suggested by the writer, AJPh. XXXII 435. *s* changes to *ch* in Slavic under conditions that, it is true, are not fully understood (chiefly after *i, u, r, k*, but also after other sounds; cp. Vondrák, Sl. Gr. II 90; Leskien, Altbulg. Elb. 29 f.). According to my above-mentioned article (*A Slavic Analogy to Verner's Law*) and according to Zupitza KZ. XXXVII 369 and Uhlenbeck KZ. XXXIX 599, Sl. *s* is inclined to become *z* when the accent follows. It is natural to assume that we might find *γ* for *z* (the velar spirant for the dental sibilant) under conditions similar to those where *ch* stands for *s*. As a matter of fact, I was able to quote (l. c.) a number of correspondences of *s* and *g*, like *drusati* 'shake': *drūgati* 'tremble', *bogŭ* 'god': *bēsŭ* 'demon'. Thus, the Slavic pronominal genitives in *-go* are clearly to be explained as developments from I. E. forms in *-so*: **to-so*, etc.; *s* became *ch* as in many other words (cp. *těchŭ*), and this was voiced when the accent followed. This belief is strengthened by the fact that geni-

tive forms with *s* actually occur in Balto-Slavic: OPruss. *s-tesse*, Sl. interrogative *česo* < I. E. **qe-so* = Goth. *hwis*; Russian *kogo* is a transfer from *togo* both as to the stem vowel and the consonant of the ending, and the neuter *čego* has levelled its consonant according to all other pronominal forms of its kind. Sl. *togo*: *česo* represent accentual differences, I. E. **to-só*: **qé-so*.

E. PROKOSCH.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

The Sanskrit Poems of Mayūra. Edited with a translation and notes and an introduction, together with the text and translation of Bāṇa's Caṇḍīsataka, by GEORGE PAYN QUACKENBOS, A. M., Ph. D., Instructor in Latin in the College of the City of New York. New York, Columbia University Press, 1917. (Volume 9 of Columbia University Indo-Iranian Series, edited by A. V. Williams Jackson, Professor of Indo-Iranian Languages in Columbia University.)

Dr. Quackenbos has collected within the covers of this volume all of the extant writings which are with certainty or likelihood attributed to the Sanskrit poet Mayūra, and has added thereto the Caṇḍīsataka of Bāṇa, which tradition says was a rival composition to Mayūra's Sūryaśataka. He has also collected, in his elaborate introduction, all the references which he was able to find in Indian literature or inscriptions to this Mayūra, or to any other person of the name. On the basis of a careful and judicious weighing of these references, he has attempted to reconstruct as much of the life of the poet as can be reconstructed with plausibility. As is unhappily the case with most even of the greatest figures in Indian literary history, the references to Mayūra are all mixt up with obviously legendary stuff, so that there is really nothing that can be said to be known, with absolute certainty, about his life. Our editor seems justified, however, in accepting the tradition that he was the contemporary—probably the rival, and perhaps the father-in-law—of the poet Bāṇa, and like him a protégé of the famous King Harṣa. If this tradition is true, Mayūra must have flourished in the first half of the seventh century A. D. Less certain appears to be the story that he was a jāṅgulika, 'snake-doctor', by profession. He was very likely a Sāura or adherent of sun-worship; almost certainly not a Jaina or a Buddhist.

The tradition that Mayūra was a leper, while very likely a myth, is interesting because of the way in which legend connects it with his two principal compositions. It is said that Mayūra composed a poem of eight stanzas in which he described, in very lascivious language, the charms of his own daughter, Bāṇa's wife. The lady was so enraged when she

heard the poem that she curst her father with leprosy; whereupon the poet composed a hundred stanzas in praise of the Sun-god, thru whose power his leprosy was removed. This is in itself interesting, and undoubtedly based on good old magico-medical theory; compare the Atharva-veda hymn 1. 22, especially verse 1, in which the sun is used in curing jaundice.

Both of these works are included in the present volume, and in fact they form nearly the whole of Mayūra's extant writings. The rest are merely some scattering verses attributed to Mayūra in various anthologies.

The more interesting of these two works is the Mayūrāṣṭaka, or 'Mayūra's Eight (Stanzas)', which Dr. Quackenbos himself discovered and edited for the first time, from a unique manuscript in the library of the University of Tübingen, in JAOS. 31. 343 ff. This edition and the accompanying translation are reprinted, with slight changes, in the present book. Unhappily the manuscript is damaged, so that two of the eight stanzas are fragmentary. Facsimiles are furnished in this book of the three pages of the manuscript, which is written in Śāradā characters. The poem is ultra-erotic in character, and fits very well the tradition about its origin. Indeed, as the editor remarks, we can hardly blame the lady to whom it was addressed for being offended by its obscenity.

Much better known, but to the general reader less interesting, is the Sūryaśataka or 'Hundred (Stanzas in praise) of the Sun'. It consists in its present form of 101 stanzas; the last stanza, which may possibly be a later addition, is an *envoi* promising absolution from sins and freedom from disease to the mortal who shall read thru the work but once, with proper devotion. Some readers may think that some such reward would be well earned. The poem is an example of the extreme of the so-called Kāvya style. In many of its verses there is not lacking a certain magnificence. Ornament is piled on elaborate ornament, till the result reminds one of a Hindu temple. And one cannot but admire the ingenuity with which a rather limited theme is varied and modulated by the exuberant fancy of the poet. But it must be said that this ingenuity often manifests itself not so much in genuine poetic images as in elaborate and intricate mazes of puns—long concatenations of plays upon words, which drive the translator to desperation. For instance, Dr. Quackenbos not infrequently has to translate an entire stanza twice, to bring out the double meanings which run thru the whole of it. This is, of course, characteristic of this whole sphere of Sanskrit poetry. Mythological allusions, too, are very abundant, and furnish the poet with many of the poetic figures of which he must have been most proud. It is not, of course, the poet's fault that these greatly add to the obscurity of his poem to Westerners. Dr. Quackenbos's very full and

excellent notes¹ furnish an indispensable first-aid in this respect, as in many others. But when all has been done that can be done, many of the stanzas must remain—as indeed the poet undoubtedly intended that they should—objects of study and meditation rather than of casual reading. They are puzzles, rather than what we understand by literature. This is quite typical of the esthetic ideals of the Kāvya style. Even a Sanskritist—nay, even our very diligent and careful editor—must admit in a few cases that the meaning remains obscure to him, in spite of the utmost pains. *Kim punar anye 'py anabhi-yuktāḥ*—what then can we expect of more casual readers?

The Caṇḍīśataka, or 'Hundred (Stanzas in praise) of Caṇḍī', by Bāṇa, said to have been written in rivalry against the Sūryaśataka of Mayūra, is in general a work of the same sort. Its (accurately) 102 stanzas are devoted to the laud of the goddess Caṇḍī or Pārvatī, consort of Śiva. And in fact all but four of them deal with one single myth about her—her slaying of the demon Mahiṣa by a blow of her foot (which in one stanza is ungallantly compared to the Vindhya Mountain). This limitation of the theme makes the stanzas considerably more monotonous than those of the Sūryaśataka. But on the other hand the language, tho by no means simple, is much less intricate and difficult than that of the rival poem; it is much easier reading.

While, as has been said, the Mayūrāṣṭaka has never been edited or translated except by Dr. Quackenbos (nor is there any native commentary to it), the editor was assisted in his work on the two other poems by editions and native commentaries, and in the case of the Sūryaśataka by the Italian translation of Bernheimer. His work, however, is independent and scholarly. His attitude towards the Hindu commentators appears to be judiciously critical. I have even noted one or two instances in which it seems to me that he has unwisely departed from the commentator's explanation (e. g. C. Ś. 46, note 4). As I have no access to the commentators, I can judge of this matter only by the editor's quotations from them in his notes. Occasionally, of course, opinions may differ as to whether the editor is right in following the commentary. Thus, in S. Ś. 55 c, it seems to me that *nandināndīninādaḥ* clearly means "Nandi's joyful shout", and that the commentator's gloss *murajaviśeṣa*, "a kind of drum", for *nāndī*, which as Q. says has no warrant in any lexicon, should be disregarded. But on the whole I am much impressed with the zeal and care and good scholarly judgment which Dr. Quackenbos has applied to his none too easy task.

¹ The notes are indeed rather too full. They frequently dilate at length on simple or obvious matters.

It is in large measure not Quackenbos's fault, as I have intimated, that in spite of all his energy and intelligence there remain, after all, quite a good many points, large and small, which are in need of further elucidation. Of this Quackenbos—who is nothing if not modest, sometimes almost over-modest—is of course quite aware. As anyone who has ever been a text-editor knows, it is bound to happen that a few things will occur to one who takes up a text for the first time, which have not occurred to another who knows the text by heart—just for that very reason. Freshness of approach gives a certain advantage, especially if it can rest upon the results attained by the patient study of others. So, standing on the broad shoulders of Quackenbos's labors, I have tried to pick a few still ungathered fruits from this *durāroha-druma*, tree that is not easily scaled. I hope the following remarks may add something, if only a little, to the understanding of the text.

S. Ś. 29 a, *tīvraṃ nirvānahetur*, and S. Ś. 86 c, *tāpasyā 'pi hetur . . . ekanirvānadāyī*. Q. fails to remember here that the literal meaning of *nirvāṇa* is "extinction" (as of fire); cf. C. Ś. 34 a, where he understands it correctly. The sun is "hot", or "the cause of heat", yet also "the cause (the sole giver) of *nirvāṇa* (extinction—as of fire or heat)."—In the same stanza S. Ś. 29, I think *iha . . . āparam* in pāda b means "in this world . . . in the other world" rather than "near . . . remote."

S. Ś. 12 d, *acaramāś*, of the rays of the sun, is questioningly rendered "(not-western, that is) eastern". It means "having no last", that is, of which none is the last, appearing simultaneously, not *seriatim*; all equal and like. It is not recorded elsewhere, to my knowledge, in Classical Sanskrit, tho it is used once in the R̥gveda (5. 58. 5, of the Maruts, compared to the spokes of a wheel, "all equal"); and in Pāli *apubbaṃ acarimaṃ* together are used in the same sense in the Milinda-pan̥ha (Trenckner, page 40, third line from bottom), and in other places, meaning "in a manner having no first and no last", "simultaneously" (cf. Morris, JPTS. 1887, p. 101, and Rhys Davids, SBE. XXXV, p. 64).

S. Ś. 21 c, *kartuṃ nā 'laṃ nimeṣaṃ divasaṃ api paraṃ yat* is rendered: "And it (the sun) is unable to <make> a wink, altho it can <create> the noble day" (the angle-brackets are used by Q. to indicate translations of *doubles ententes*). I should render: "It is unable to make a wink (punningly, a minute), but on the other hand (it can make) a day." *Nimeṣa* means both "wink" and "minute" or "instant", a small unit of time; *paraṃ* I think is an adverb. Sūrya is of course proverbially the "Day-maker". Bernheimer's rendering, quoted in Q.'s note, is wholly wrong. The point is that the Sun can

and does make a day, which is a large period of time, tho it cannot make a (small period of time, an instant; but really, a) wink.

S. Ś. 75 c, *kālavyalasya cihnam*: "it (the sun's disk) is the (crest-) ornament of the Serpent Time." Q. renders "Serpent of Time" and is uncertain who is meant; the serpent is Time itself, for, in Sanskrit as in English, Time is "creeping". In Vikramacarita, Metrical Recension 9 (11). 10, occurs the phrase *dinamaniḥ sarpatkālasarpaṣiromaniḥ*, "the jewel of day (the sun), the head-gem of the serpent, creeping Time." This is a strikingly perfect parallel to the expression under discussion.

These are the most important and certain of the corrections of the translation which I have been able to make. The rest are either minor points, or less certain. With them I follow the order of the printed book.

Mayūrāṣṭaka: 1 a: *prastutāṅgī*, perhaps "with limbs prepared (for love)" rather than "with beautiful limbs."—d: read "*gūhya* (*āgūhya*)"?—2 c, and 5 d: *kena* in both cases to be taken as attributive to the following instrumental noun: "by what bee . . .", "by what demon . . ."—5 a: may not *pathī* be for *pathi*, "on the path", with metrical lengthening of *i*?—7 b: *prabhācandravat*, perhaps "like the resplendent moon (in its crescent shape)."—8 a: *bhāva* in connexion with *hāva* must, I think, mean "passion"; the two terms are frequently associated thus. "Shining with love, allurements, and passion."

Sūryaṣṭaka: 6 c: *nighna*, perhaps better "full of" than "subject [only] to."—8 d: I think *khacita* means "studded", as if with jewels.—10 a: *bandha*, in the second rendering, "enclosure (in the bud)."—b: probably no *double entente* in *lokānām*.—d: *ketavah* perhaps "eclipsers" (and punningly, "rays"). Ketu, the Dragon's Tail, the ninth planet, is mythologically the body of the demon of eclipse, whose head is Rāhu.—15 a: *madhura* better "charming" than "soft", in both renderings.—18 b, c: the passage is hard, but I suggest that *pradeśasthito 'pi* goes with the following. "Tho it remains fixedly (appears regularly) in (the same) place (it always comes in the east), because of due regard for place and time, still it attains to the name of 'new' in Indra's quarter (it is nevertheless called 'new' every time it arises)."—23 b: the concept of "ink" is not needed for *kajjala*; darkness is directly compared to lamp-black.—25 a: *prasamita*, "that is powerful enough to overcome the strength of the mighty stars."—b: *līlayā*, "easily" rather than "scornfully"?—30: tho Q.'s general idea is correct, I should phrase his summary of the stanza (in note 1) rather thus: "The splendor of jewels is useful for ornamentation; of fire, for burning wood etc.; of the moon, for giving refreshment by its own coolness; but the splendor of

the sun exceeds each of these in its own field; for it adorns the three worlds, burns sin, and gives refreshment by rain."—31 d: *avalīdham* is literally "lickt".—32 d: I do not think there is any double entente in *añjana*, which probably cannot mean "fire", in spite of *Viçva* in ÇKDr.—38 b: *parihṛta*°, "envelops, because of its subtilty, the utmost recesses" etc.; *upānta* adjective.—39 c: *diṇmukhānām*, simply "quarters" (literally, faces of the q.). There is something wrong with this line; *anu* can hardly be rendered twice as *Q.* has done; but I don't see thru it.—42 d: *sphuṭa*°, perhaps also punningly, of the sun: "it is the occasion of the expanded-lotus-cup" (*apāçraya*=*āçraya*).—45 b: *-prthuśvāsa-*, "their panting is abundant"; *śramena* should be translated with this line, "parcht with fatigue."—d: *sarala*, "outstrecht" (necks).—46 c: *kaṭaka*, "ridge", better than "zone"; *kliṣṭasūtā* doubtless has the meaning suggested as a second alternative in note 9, cf. 48 c.—48, note 5, last line on page; the point is lost unless "mares" be substituted for "other horses".—52 a: *dūranamrāir*, "who make obeisance from a (respectful) distance."—55 b: *param* probably adverb, "moreover".—d: *vinatānandanah*, simply "son of V."—56 c: *kula-*, "noble" (lit. "of [good] family").—62 d: *avataran*, "arriving at, coming to."—78 b: *taḍiti* seems to be rendered "with a crash"; of course it means "with a flash of lightning."—85 c: *aparavaśo*, perhaps "subdued, not one's own master", and so "ill", cf. *a-svastha*.—98 b, c: I think Bernheimer was right in taking *gām* as "earth" and *-grāva-* as "rocks"; *go* "sky" and *grāvan* "clouds" are supported only by Nāigh.—Understand *vilīna* literally, "melted".

Anthology Stanzas: Śiva and Pārvatī, 2 a: *kim me durodareṇa*, means (freely) "what did I say about the dice-play? (that is, I didn't say anything about it)".

Caṇḍisataka: 3 c and 4 d: *jayati, jayanti* should be translated "hail to", as has been rightly done in 21, 33, 38, 54, 71, 102.—18 d: *kula-*, "noble", seems to be omitted in the translation.—37 d: would it not be better to take *kurvānā sarvaṃ* with the prec., "doing everything as before in the case of Paçupati", and *iṣad* as part of the fol. cpd., "with slightly laid-on foot-lac"?—39 a: *āvyomavyāpīṣimnām* would be much better taken as a cpd., as suggested in note.—46 a: *dhr̥tim akr̥ta*, perhaps better "did (not) stop still", in both cases (in the first case perhaps with double meaning, "took no pleasure"); *dele* "because of his fondness for dissension".—67 c: *mātur* better with *mahiṣavadhamahe*?—97, note 3: this is correct, but it should have been brought out clearly in the translation; it is a commonplace use of *kva . . . kva*.—102 d: *sarvāṅgīṇam*, perhaps adverb, "whole-body-wise", "in a manner that affected his whole body"; or if adj., "with his whole body"; in any

case the body must be Mahiṣa's, not Caṇḍi's. I think Q. fails to understand quite what is meant by Monier Williams' definition. Bühler's rendering is free but essentially correct.

On page 237, V. L. to Bāṇa's 'Traveler', (c), Q. reads *cch* for *ch* "for metrical reasons"—quite unnecessarily, since *ch* always counts as a double consonant for metrical purposes. So he repeatedly prints *cch* at the beginning of a word, where *ch* is more proper; e. g. C. Ś. 22 a.

FRANKLIN EDGERTON.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

A Manual of the Writings in Middle English, 1050-1400. By JOHN EDWIN WELLS, M. L., M. A., Ph. D., Professor of English Literature in Beloit College. Published under the Auspices of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences. New Haven: Yale University Press. London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1916.

This is an admirable piece of work. When a mature scholar who might well have been devoting himself to his own problems spends years in searching, compiling and summarizing to form a tool which will save others from having to do the like, we can only say 'Ingentes gratias agimus', without the risk of eternally scratching ourselves among the flatterers. Indeed, the perseverance, grasp and judgment involved in an extensive critical bibliography make it of the nature of a direct contribution to knowledge; it is a history of scholarship on the subject concerned.

The increase of such tools as concordances and bibliographies gives us the agreeable feeling that early English studies have passed out of their nonage. There may be a little regret that we can less often than once look at each other with a wild surmise as some new planet swims into our ken, though even that pleasure may still be had; but we can be more confident of not overlooking an old one, and can more easily make the combinations which produce new knowledge, and can in some sort grasp the scheme of things entire. Such bibliographies as those of Ward and Herbert, and Miss Billings' incomplete one, for the romances, that of Child for the ballads, Miss Hammond's for Chaucer, C. F. Brown's for the religious lyric (Bibliographical Society, 1916), and those in the Cambridge History of English Literature, give us in more or less degree this feeling of confidence and grasp. There is still greatly needed a bibliography for the Middle English (and Anglo-

Saxon) linguistic field; for the historical, we have Gross; and for the literary,—here we are.

Dr. Wells' plan is most comprehensive; to include the facts about "all the extant writings in print, from single lines to the most extensive pieces, composed in English between 1050 and 1400", as well as some later ones; to give descriptions and summaries, and to epitomize critical and historical fact and opinion about them. This forms the first and longer part of his imposing volume. The Bibliographical Notes "seek to indicate all the really valuable prints, editions, and discussions of the several writings and classes or types of writing". The work is therefore meant to be neither a literary history nor a bibliography pure and simple, but a summary of fact and opinion, and an indication of where to go for it all in full.

Both parts will be valuable and convenient for the beginning student and the accomplished scholar; will save their time, and supersede or at least supplement their own collections. One of the most laborious and valuable elements in the work is the sorting out and classifying of the whole enormous material. The classification and arrangement are sometimes a trifle arbitrary, and inconsistent without advantage; it is odd to interject proverbs, and scientific and informational treatises, among religious authors and works, and chapters on lyric and drama among those on the chief individual authors; to separate political lyrics (only) from the main chapter on lyrics. The summaries of works, while generally accurate and useful, are needlessly long where the subject is familiar, as with Chaucer, since the book is hardly for the general reader. The ten-page account of Chaucer's life seems superfluous. In his high admiration for *Piers Plowman* and a slight tendency to underrate Chaucer, Dr. Wells reveals an inclination toward a moral interest in the content rather than an esthetic interest in the content and form of literature. The book contains a considerable amount of original literary criticism; accordingly, we sometimes find a curious combination of censure, appreciation and impersonal scholarship, with perhaps over-much of the two former for an objective work. It certainly trenches on the ground of history which it professes to avoid. The natural conception of such a book is that it should contain a minimum with which the user may disagree. The criticism makes good reading, however. Some would have preferred, perhaps, that the two grand divisions of the work should have been combined; that a statement of the main facts about each item should have been followed (but only for the less well-known works) by a brief summary and criticism; and those by a critical and summarizing bibliography. Thus opinions would have been at once referred to their authors, and time would have been saved, in many cases, at least.

As to what will probably be for most workers the most valuable part of the work, the bibliography, utter completeness is probably unattainable and is certainly needless. A somewhat careful examination of crucial parts shows that Dr. Wells' aim at substantial completeness was in general successful. For Chaucer he means to supplement, not to supersede, Miss Hammond's Bibliographical Manual, to which he sends the reader for each item. Miss Hammond's note on the Franklin's Tale in *Modern Language Notes*, XXVII. 91-2, should have been mentioned, since it is later than her Manual; Gummere on Chaucer's medieval and modern sides, in the *Modern Language Publications*, XVI. xxxvii-xl., should have been mentioned, as being of general interest and as ignored by Miss Hammond. For Layamon (so-called; if Dame Siri3, p. 178, Ernle3e, p. 191, why not Lazamon?) there might be mentioned an account and specimen of the Caligula MS in the *New Paleographical Society*, Ser. 1, vol. 2 (London, 1903-12), plate 86; a review of Hoffmann's dissertation by Jordan in *Engl. Stud.* XLII. 262-4; an article on Anglo-Norman words in Layamon by Payne in *Notes and Queries* (1869), Ser. 4, vol. 4, pp. 26-7. On Godric and his lyrics reference might have been made to Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora* (Rolls Ser.), II. 264-274, 352, and to Giraldus Cambrensis (*ib.*), II. 214-6. On Gower's *Mirour* (not *Miroir*) de l'Omme reference might have been made (as to the date) to G. L. Kittredge, *Date of Chaucer's Troilus* (Chaucer Soc. 1909), 80-2, and to the present reviewer's *Development and Chronology of Chaucer's Works* (*ib.* 1907), pp. 220-225; also to *Mod. Lang. Notes*, XXI. 239-240. A recording in print of Professor Wells' minor slips would serve no good purpose.

A reviewer's difficulty is often that the enumeration of minor matters which he would have liked to see otherwise fills more space and sometimes makes more impression than his words of warm appreciation. The present reviewer will round out by repeating his first sentence. This is an admirable piece of work.

JOHN S. P. TATLOCK.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY.

Les Anciens Peuples de l'Europe. GEORGES DOTTIN. Pp. XIV + 302. (Vol. I of Collection pour l'étude des antiquités nationales.) C. Klincksieck, Paris, 1916.

M. Camille Jullian announces that he and M. Dottin, in beginning the publication of a series of works upon the antiquities of France, have wished to inaugurate the collection by

dedicating the first volume to the most ancient peoples of all Europe. A number of other volumes are already under way, and the names of Cagnat, Toutain, Besnier—to mention only a few—are indicative of the character of the work which will appear in this new series.

M. Jullian writes the introduction to this first volume. He says that he considers the purpose of the book is to show how necessary it is for the historian to make himself acquainted with the literature, the archaeology, the political economy, the anthropology, the geology, and so on, of a country. He calls Fustel de Coulanges to witness that history is the most difficult of all sciences. But he also seems to recognize in his phrase—even if it is said in another connection—"il n'est pas bon, en matière d'histoire, d'avoir trop d'esprit", that many of M. Dottin's pages are rather heavily loaded with narrative that is not entirely unlike a cross between a Catalogue of the Ships and a first chapter of St. Matthew.

After the first chapter, which is entitled *Les Sources*, but which might as well have been called *Caveat Lector*, one comes to forty pages on *Les Civilisations* which give a clear and readable account of the various cultural strata of the European peoples. The author has handled his sources with acumen and diligence, and one is fain to believe that he has not used some of the latest books because he felt some hesitancy as to the final acceptance of many of the results set forth in them. *Les Peuples* is the title of the third chapter, which fills pages 66-224. Here the author takes up all the European peoples one after another and follows their movements as mentioned in the ancient writers, with an occasional reference to archaeological and anthropological material. He recognizes as precarious the results gained from ancient sources as to the life of peoples, but thinks it interesting and perhaps useful to make a grouping of customs. Thus he finds (page 73) that women worked in the fields among certain peoples, that a community of land is found among others, that cannibalism is mentioned among still others, that here there is polygamy and there community of women, that matriarchy, tattooing, hospitality, human sacrifice, and so on, are elsewhere. It would have been more interesting if the idea could have been developed so that something would seem to have been proved. M. Dottin seems to entertain a genial openmindedness as to the Amazons, and for him the Pelasgi are a mighty people. Whether he has not allowed himself to be contaminated with the prevalent view of late years about the Pelasgi, or is taking up cudgels to restore to a place in the sun a people which has been a bit over-relegated into oblivion, I cannot quite determine. M. Dottin also deals at length with the Ligures, and makes them out a great people who inhabited much of Italy and who spread their power up the Rhone, and perhaps

as far as Spain. But what if the Ligures had been an Alpine people who could not live on the coast or in the low river valleys, or what if they and the Veneti had earlier been one Po valley people and had been split apart by invaders from the north and forced back, the one into the high mountains above Genoa, and the other into the marsh lands at the mouth of the Po? It would have been well to note the discussion of the Ligures in Ridgeway's chapter in *A Companion to Latin Studies*, and in Peet's *The Stone and Bronze Ages in Italy*. The work of Pinza seems not to be known at all to M. Dottin.

The last chapter (IV) is a short one on the local and general history of Europe. It is like the third chapter in being a mass of proper names. They are necessary, no doubt, and M. Dottin must be congratulated on having brought such a mass of material into so small a compass. And yet one cannot help but feel that overmuch weight is given to the ancient sources—they make up about nine-tenths of the citations—for they are generally considered pretty unreliable in their statements about the comings and goings of ancient peoples. None the less, the book is a valuable manual and will be warmly welcomed.

R. V. D. MAGOFFIN.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

The Arden Shakespeare: General Editor, C. H. HERFORD, Litt. D. *The Merchant of Venice*, edited by H. L. WITHERS, B. A., the American edition revised by MORRIS W. CROLL, Ph. D. *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, edited by E. K. CHAMBERS, B. A., the American edition revised by EDITH RICKERT, Ph. D. *As You Like It*, edited by J. C. SMITH, M. A., the American edition revised by ERNEST HUNTER WRIGHT, Ph. D.

A certain well-known college professor used to begin his lectures on Shakespeare with the frank statement that the object of his course was to find out what the language of Shakespeare means. The result was an absorption in questions of grammar and philology and an unfortunate neglect of the plays as poetry. The editors of the Arden Shakespeare, seeking to maintain a more appropriate relation between literary appreciation and linguistics, have chosen to emphasize the literary aspect of the plays. The revised American edition preserves the general character previously given to the series. The text is preceded in each volume by a literary history of the

play, including a generous discussion of the sources, the structure, and the important characters. It is followed by copious notes, which reflect the prevailing interest in the unfolding of the plot rather than in language, and by appendices dealing with special problems. An explanation of the metre is also provided by each editor.

The series provides a useful text of Shakespeare for the general reader, who must rely for guidance wholly upon his editor, as well as for the use of schools, in which a competent teacher may readily supplement the apparatus. The discussion of Shakespeare's sources might profitably include brief extracts as well as a statement of the literary problems. In "As You Like it", for example, Lodge's Rosalind and even the Tale of Gamelyn might well be so represented.

J. C. FRENCH.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

Seneca: ad Lucilium Epistulae Morales. With an English translation by RICHARD M. GUMMERE. Vol. I. New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1917. \$1.50.

This new volume of the Loeb Classical Library is an excellent translation of the first sixty-five Letters to Lucilius. It follows Seneca's own rule, "ut non verbis serviamus, sed sensibus"; and it actually reproduces something of his 'pointed style'. One passage needs revision, namely, the rendering of the wonderful description of the stately, conscious Roman speech, "Romanus sermo magis se circumspicit et aestimat praebetque aestimandum" (Ep. 40, 11). This suggests the slow processional march of some stately figure who looks around upon herself, or upon her train, and 'takes stock of' herself, and allows the spectators time to do the same. Professor Gildersleeve has suggested that in the *κατασκελῆς* of Dionysios Hal. (Iud. Isocr. 3) we have "an admirable adjective for the deliberate, swaying, processional style of Isokrates" (A. J. P. XI 372), and it is possible that Seneca's epithet 'gradarius' should be interpreted in much the same way—"Cicero . . . gradarius fuit". In the same section 'interpungere' can hardly be taken literally, of the separation of the words in Roman texts. In Ep. 46, 1, 'levis' probably refers to the bulk of the book, rather than to the style. The conjecture 'qui titubat' for 'qui itaque?' (Ep. 40, 9) is not very convincing. 'Conferet', p. 370, l. 2, is a misprint for 'conferret', and on p. 81, l. 11, the word 'as' should be struck out.

W. P. MUSTARD.

REPORTS.

HERMES, XLVIII.

Fascicle 3.

Zur Geschichte der meteorologischen Litteratur (321-358). W. Capelle sketches the ancient history of Meteorology, with special reference to the terms applied to this study (cf. A. J. P. XXXV, p. 218, XXXVII, p. 491). Aristotle laid the foundation with his *Μετεωρολογικά*, which dealt with sublunar phenomena; but included, besides comets, meteors, etc., also earthquakes, hydrology and even the milky way. Theophrastus avoids the ambiguity of *μετέωρος*, by using the words *μετάρσιος* and *οὐράνιος* of meteorological and astronomical phenomena, respectively, and entitled his work *Μεταρσιολογικά*. Posidonius adopted this terminology, except that his regular word for astronomical facts was *μετέωρα*. After Posidonius only compilations and extracts of meteorological works were made, in which the terminology wavered, until the authority of Aristotle established the more familiar word meteorology.

Studien zur Entstehung der Plebs (359-377). A. Rosenberg, from the meaning of sacrosanctus, the institution of the tribunate and the lex Icilia de Aventino, reaches conclusions that are based on Ed. Meyer (A. J. P. XVII, p. 379). The majority of the original inhabitants of Rome were Latin merchants, artisans, etc., who, with increasing prosperity, naturally aspired to citizenship; and, failing of this, then succeeded in obtaining from the ruling class the privilege of organizing themselves into four tribes with their own magistrates: tribunes, iudices decemviri and aediles, all of whom, by a foedus, were declared to be sacrosancti, a term used in agreements between independent states, which, in the absence of a supreme power to enforce the provisions, were accustomed to proclaim an offender as sacer. When the power of the plebs became predominant in 287 B. C., the sacrosancti, now only the tribunes, were protected by the government. The above four tribes worshiped on the Aventine the Latin goddess Diana, in whose temple the oldest document (456 B. C.?) pertaining to the plebs was preserved. This granted them the privilege of dwelling on the Aventine. The Roman state, at that time, was composed of three classes: the ruling patricians, the dependent peasantry and, holding an intermediate position, the four tribes of the plebs. It now became the ambition of the dependent peasants to obtain similar rights, which was consummated in the estab-

lishment of the sixteen rural tribes. The patricians may have thought that, as these new tribes were composed of their clients, they would strengthen their power, whereas the result was the ultimate predominance of the common people. The discussion of passages from the historians, and other details are interesting.

Hippokratische Forschungen IV (378-407). H. Diels here (cf. A. J. P. XXXV, p. 222; XXXVI, p. 351), elucidates and emends the text of the treatise *de arte*, with some sharp criticism of Gomperz' edition, as well as of the author, a polyhistor sophist, who was bent on displaying his rhetorical skill. Gomperz errs in attributing the work to Protagoras (A. J. P. XI 529). D. closes with a supplement to Hauler's collation of two MSS.

Plotinische Studien (408-425). H. F. Müller, the veteran editor and interpreter of Plotinus (cf. Berl. Phil. W. 1908, p. 899), by means of the exegesis of selected passages and a consideration of the general character of P.'s philosophy, shows that C. Steinhart (Pauly, RE.) and Ed. v. Hartmann (Gesch. d. Metaphysik I) are right in denying for Plotinus a doctrine of emanation, over against the positive assertion of M. Heinze (Protest. Realencycl. V and XIII; cf. Grundriss d. Gesch. d. Phil.⁷, p. 311).

Solon und Peisistratos (426-441). E. von Stern constructs the version of the old Attic chronicle, dealing with Solon's opposition to Peisistratus' request for a body-guard, etc., and the latter's leniency, from Aristotle, Aelian and a few points in Plutarch, in substantial agreement with Busolt (II 311-315), from whom (p. 315, n. 2) he has apparently adopted the name Hegesistratus for the archon Hegestratos (cf. Plut. Solon 32 and Kirchner, Prosopogr. 6309). Aristotle initiated the biographical utilization of Solon's poems. A comparison of the above sources with Diodorus, Diogenes Laertius and Hermippus (in Plutarch), shows how the original account was expanded through sensationalism and error. S. argues that the number fifty of the body-guard granted to Peisistratus, according to Plutarch (Solon 30), was derived by an old chronicler from the original decree, as well as the name Aristion, who proposed it. The conventional use, however, of this number makes this doubtful; neither Herodotus (I 59), nor Aristotle (Polit. 14), specify a number.

Horaz C. I 34 (442-449). W. W. Jaeger shows that the Fortuna of this ode is the Asiatic-Hellenistic *Τύχη*; not the early conception of a guardian of kings; but *Τύχη-Πεπωμένη*, the world power, to which the numerous sudden and unexpected political upheavals in Alexandrian and Roman times were due. Diespiter etc. serves only as the apparatus poeticus.

The central thought lies in the last five verses. J. gives an interesting excursus on the development of this divinity and its characteristics.

Lateinische Gedichte auf Inschriften (450-457). W. Heraeus discusses Einar Engström's *Carmina latina epigr.* (1912). In no. 108 (VI century), from a stone in Africa, he recognizes Martial I 40 (41): *Qui ducis vultus etc.*, the *ista* of which evidently refers to the Christian inscription on the left. This further proof of *toto notus in orbe Martialis* may be added to Mart. VI 76, 4 and II 59, 4, found on late Christian stones in Seville (Spain) and in Britain. Part of Mart. I 114 appears in no. 362. Poetical reminiscences of Tibullus and of the *Carmina Priapea* are also pointed out. Corrections of text and interpretation are given. In Diehl's collection of lat. altchristl. Inschriften², no. 6 is printed as prose, although it is clearly in iambic senarii, with a Christian tag in prose.

Die rechtliche Bedeutung der Inauguration beim Flaminat (458-463). St. Brassloff argues that the nomination of a *flamen Dialis* required confirmation by *inauguratio* (cf. Gaius Inst. I 130; III 114; Ulpian fgm. X, 5). The passage in Livy 40, 42, 8 ff., on which the prevailing opposite view is based, really confirms his position, inasmuch as here the second alternate was straightway inaugurated when the proceedings of the *comitia calata*, dealing with the first nominee, had been interrupted by a divine sign. The laying of a fine on the recalcitrant first nominee by the *pontifex maximus* was an act of anticipation. The nomination of a vestal virgin was different as here the inauguration took place *pro collegio*, and so followed without any interval of time.

Zu Diokles (464-468). M. Wellmann defends the genuineness of a citation from Diocles of Carystus in ps.-Galen XIX 529 ff. (K.), against J. Heeg (Sitzungsb. d. Königl. Pr. Ak. d. W. 1911).

Miscellen: N. J. Krom (469-471) calls attention to a Sanskrit inscription from Gwalior, central India, found 1909 (cf. Ann. Report, Arch. Survey of India 1908-9, Calcutta 1912, p. 126 ff.), which shows that Heliiodorus, a Greek, but a worshiper of Krishna, came from Taxila (Cf. Kiepert, *Lehrb. d. alt. Geogr.* p. 36) as an ambassador of Antalcidas, thus locating the last of the later Greek kings (circ. 150 B. C.). K. discusses some transliterations, viz., *'Αγγοίλας* > *Agicala*, showing *η* > *i*, circ. 78 A. D.—R. M. Meyer (471-474) in answer to Reitzenstein (cf. A. J. P. XXXVIII, p. 216), cites other passages from Tacitus in favor of an old Arminius ballad; but especially the funeral lament over Attila (Jordanes 257, cf. Paul u. Braunes Beitr. 37, 537 f.).—A. Gudeman (474-477) makes it

probable that the unsuitable *sudibus* in Eumenius paneg. 9[4 Bs.¹]2, 3, was derived from Tac. dialog. 34, l. 21, where all the MSS erroneously have *sudibus* (for *rudibus*), and utilizes this fact as another proof of the authorship of Tacitus.—K. Praechter (477-480) discovers a new fragment of Ariston of Chios in Comm. in Arist. Graeca XX, Bk. V, p. 248, 17 ff., where 'Ἀρίστων ὁ Χῖος ($\chi + \iota$, appearing like M) was corrupted into 'Ἀριστόνομος > 'Ἀριστόνυμος. No new doctrine of A. is obtained; but interesting is the polemic against his point of view, which is essentially like Cicero, de off. 1, 6 and de fin. 2, 43; 3, 50.—M. Holleaux (480) sends corrections for p. 75 ff.

Fascicle 4.

Per l'interpretazione del testo etrusco di Agram (481-493). E. Lattes discusses Etruscan words, particularly *vinum*, on the linen mummy-cloths at Agram, with especial regard for G. Herbig's views. He expresses his belief that we have here a funerary document, in which the words *flere* and *vinum* are associated with the name of a deity, implying libations. (Cf. Berl. Phil. W. 1903, nos. 5 and 6, and 1904, nos. 19 and 20.)

Über Lukians Phalarideen (494-521). B. Keil analyses the two Phalaris speeches α and β , showing the Lysianic style of α and the more rhetorical character of β . The latter comprises sections 1-9; then follow sections 10-13, which, he shows, are made up of six excerpts, carelessly added to β from a similar, third speech, which like β presupposed α . It was still more rhetorical than β ; but much less so than the undoubtedly genuine *Τυραννοκτόνος*.

Plautusstudien. I. Stoffprobleme des Rudens (522-541). G. Thiele discusses the plot, as originally obtained from Diphilus. Leo pointed out the influence of tragedy on the Rudens; but its main motif, the storm and wreck, appears nowhere in tragedy; whereas it occurs frequently in novelistic literature, to which the comic poets frequently turned in search of new material. Hence it is significant that the chief catastrophe in the *Historia Apollonii* is a wreck on the coast of Cyrene, especially as the loose combination with an erotic adventure is also found in Apollonius, where it seems more natural. Th. discusses the local descriptions and their romantic color in the New Comedy, and points out a number of such passages in the Rudens, which surpasses the extant plays of the New Comedy in this respect. Other romantic features are also pointed out. The realism of the brothel stories is by no means absolute. The *Vidularia*, based on the same plot, is later than the Rudens. A search for New Comedy plots in Christian romances and legends and in the *Gesta Romanorum* is desirable.

Die Epitoma des Livius (542-557). A. Klotz attacks the prevailing belief in an epitome of Livy that has been assumed to explain linguistic differences between Livy and authors depending on him. These differences can be amply explained by the popularity of a collection of historical exempla (cf. A. J. P. XXXIV, p. 224). The widespread use of a Livy-epitome is questionable, as the whole work continued in use, for which, besides other evidence, K. cites Symmachus, epist. IX 13. The periochae, of course, point to the whole work, barring the lost books 136 and 137; and at least two sets of these existed, if not four (including that of Martial XIV 190). The problem of certain disagreements of the periochae with Livy, can be understood, as they were detached, and, leading an independent existence, were subjected to changes and contamination; here too the influence of the exempla can be proved. The theory that the periochae developed out of an epitome disregards the fact that the early epitomes reduced the number of books of the original. Justin's epitome of Trogus represents a later practice. His date probably falls in the fourth century.

Ὑποθήκαι (558-616). P. Friedländer discusses under this title Hesiod's Erga, Theognis' elegies (mainly vv. 1-254), and a few ὑποθήκαι of Democritus, which were part of a work not identical with his Περὶ εὐθυμίας. The lost Χίρωνος Ὑποθήκαι, of which he gives an account, has suggested the title of the article. As an appellative we find ὑποθήκαις Ἡσιόδοιο in I. G. VII, 4240 (cf. Isocrates Πρὸς Νικοκλέα § 43). By means of careful analysis F. finds threads of association and form, which reveal an original unity in all of these works. This loose method of binding together seemingly independent parts should be recognized as characteristic of this type of literature. Thus in Hesiod, contentious Eris has her place in vv. 1-302, competitive Eris in vv. 383-694; moreover these two parts are held together by a chain of gnomes (303-382), which are linked together by form and associated ideas. The precepts are frequently more intelligible when referred to actual events. Theognis' method of composition in vv. 1-254, is similar to that of Hesiod, and apparently independent parts have their connections, viz., vv. 29-128 might be entitled Concerning Friends and Enemies; vv. 129-196, Concerning Riches and Poverty; moreover the second series is anticipated in vv. 29/30. The selections from Democritus were chosen as representative of the oldest prose examples of ὑποθήκαι literature, prose succeeding poetry here as in other branches of Greek literature.

Miscellen: F. Münzer (617-619) points out the rhetorical commonplaces in Tacitus' account of Arminius (ann. II 88), especially his dependence on Xen. Cyrop. I, 2, 1, the first literary biography devoted to a great man of a foreign race.—R. Reit-

zenstein (619-623) answers R. M. Meyer's defense of an Arminius ballad (see Miscellen 471-474 above), and concludes from the evidence that Meyer cites, that the existence of Arminius ballads lacks all proof.—O. Sch. von Fleschenberg (623-628) shows that Asclepiades Myrleanus subdivided his rhetorical classification of *ιστορία* according to an historical-realistic point of view, which explains the double occurrence of the *τρόπος γενεαλογικός*.—The same (629-630) shows that Apuleius, in his *ἡθοποιία* of the robber (Met. 81, 6-91, 8), aimed at a comic effect in combining the stories of Lamachus, Alcimus and Thrasyleon to exemplify the *γνώμη* that it is easier to break into the dwellings of the rich than of the poor.—K. Hubert (631-633) improves the order of the palimpsest fragments containing Cicero's Pro M. Tullio oration: § 52 is closely associated with §§ 38-46, and §§ 47-51 should follow §§ 53-56.—P. Stengel (634-636) discusses *προϊερᾶσθαι* in Dittenb. Syll. 627, 7 and *προϊερητεύειν* in Syll. 599, 10 as synonyms of *κατάρχεσθαι*; the former is exactly like *προκατάρχεσθαι* in Thuc. I, 25. They do not mean 'to act as priest for another' (Fraenkel).—2. He emends in Plut. Cim. 18 *ἀπέτεμε* to *ἐνέτεμε*, which, strictly, would imply a *σφάγιον*; but Plutarch is not exact in his use of sacrificial terminology.—P. Maas (636) accepts H. Weil's proof, grounded on Augustin. de mus. 5, 26, that the equation $3^2 + 4^2 = 5^2$ is the *ratio geometrica* that Varro applied to the hexameter verse (cf. *Études de litt. et de rythm. gr.* (1902) 142); but considers his own interpretation worthy of note (cf. A. J. P. XXXVIII, p. 215).

HERMAN LOUIS EBELING.

GOUCHER COLLEGE.

RIVISTA DI FILOLOGIA, XLV (1917).

Fascicolo 2.

Lvcretiana V. (177-189). Ettore Stampini discusses or emends the text of Lucretius V, 483-486; 878-881; 1442.

Di un *ἀπαξ εἰρημένον* logico o di pensiero presso Quintiliano (190-196). Pietro Rasi takes up anew and discusses at length the old crux of Vergil's *cui non risere parentes* (E. IV, 62) and Quintilian's citation of it (IX, 3, 8) as, *qui non risere parentes*. He supports the Vergilian text, *cui non*, etc., as just given. He thinks that Quintilian's citation of it as, *qui non* etc., was due either to a poor text or more likely to a poor memory.

La biblioteca di Zomino da Pistoia (197-207). Remigio Sabadini gives an interesting account of Zomino (also Zombino).

Zembino, Zambino), born 1387, died 1458, ecclesiastic, author, and, in his time, a notable collector of books. Sabbadini gives a list of 111. Of these, 33 are now lost. The rest are scattered about in the various libraries mentioned by him.

Il codice Bresciano di Tibullo (208-239). Ferruccio Callonghi concludes his lengthy discussion of this manuscript and gives a careful and complete list of variants. His conclusions are that Br. was derived from a manuscript very similar to Ambr., much more so than to V. When there is a difference of reading between Ambr. and V., Br. generally agrees with Ambr. Br. may possibly go back to a copy of the archetype or even to a parallel of the archetype, but in either case to a manuscript more carelessly written than either A. or V.

Una polemica epicurea contro le dottrine stoiche della provvidenza, del fato, della fortuna contenuta nel papiro ercolanese 1670 (240-281). Ettore Bignone takes up this papyrus, already examined by Bassi in vol. XLIV, p. 47, of the Rivista, and subjects it to a thorough-going review and investigation. He believes that the writer was an Epicurean, probably Philodemus. At all events the subject is a polemic against the Stoic doctrine of Providence as developed by Chrysippus.

Recensioni (282-332).

Note bibliografiche (333-351).

Rassegna di pubblicazioni periodiche (352-373).

Pubblicazioni ricevute dalla Direzione (374-376).

KIRBY FLOWER SMITH.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

BRIEF MENTION.

The scheme of the Journal allows a tithe to *Brief Mention*. In earlier days there was not the same affluence of contributions as there is now. In those times many of my own articles were written to fill gaps and I had little scruple in making broad my phylacteries. Of late, I have been embarrassed by an excess of material and I feel that apologies are due on my part to both readers and contributors for the inordinate number of pages that I have occupied in the present volume to the exclusion of more strictly philological work; for as I near the end, I find myself reverting to the earlier stages of my long career. The article on Paulus Silentarius grew out of a *Brief Mention*, and the same thing is true of the paper entitled *An Oxford Scholar* in another part of the present number. These things ought properly to have been reserved for a projected volume of *Brief Mentions Suppressed and Unsuppressed*, which I had in contemplation some years ago, and I sympathize with the παρακλαιοῖθνα of those who are waiting to make their addresses to the public. But those who know the inside history of the Journal will pardon the superfluities of an editor who has renounced so much in order to furnish an arena for American scholarship and finds no other field open for the exercise of such activities as are left to him (A. J. P. XXXIII 227).

That consummate artist Jane Austen, the centenary of whose death was celebrated the other day, kept the turmoil of the great wars of her time out of her novels and when the world's great war of our time, of all times began, I tried to make the Journal a sheltered nook. But I have not succeeded. Eclipses of the sun repeat themselves under the foliage of rosebushes, and now that the word 'American' itself means war to the knife, the allusions become more patent and more pointed, although I have not forgotten my own admonitions against historical parallels and the so-called lessons of history. For many years the Germans have been the acknowledged leaders in Greek studies. Every now and then some German professor like the late Herr Jordan goes over bodily to the Roman camp, and the Graeculi are not handled with gloves by German exponents of classical perfection, but it is an inter-

esting speculation what will become of Greek studies in Germany after the war.

Much will necessarily be taboo. A correspondent informs me that a protest has been entered in Germany against including the Philippics of Demosthenes in the course of Greek studies. Perhaps the movement has been inspired from above,—the German 'from above', not the St. James 'from above'. In Jackson's Memoir of Bywater (p. 198), discussed in the earlier part of this number, it is recorded that the Emperor spoke airily, if not very tactfully to Bywater, a Professor of Greek, about the narrowing requirements of Greek in the German school system. The laborious analysis of Xenophon's *Anabasis* by Joost (A. J. P. XIV 102) is the result of a conviction that this limitation to the Kaiser's own range of reading would be welcome to the All Highest; and one is almost tempted to suspect that Wilamowitz's proposal to jettison the Greek accents is due to some court story about the Kaiser's schooldays. In the old days of the *Fliegende Blätter* there was a cartoon representing a subordinate official, some 'Staatshämorrhoidarius', bowing to the ground before his chief with the legend from Alexander von Humboldt 'The curved line occurs only in organic nature'. Nothing is so well organized as Teutonic officialdom. We are and have been for years in the domain of 'Realpolitik' for which the 'Realgymnasium' had been preparing the way for many decades. And now quite apart from Wilhelm's general attitude towards Greek, Demosthenes' attitude towards the Emperor's predecessor in the superman business must be excluded from the school as possibly offensive to the Kaiser. Run through Olynthiacs and Philippics and you will find significant phrase after phrase. I have space for a few only. 1, 5: ὅλως ἄπιστον οἶμαι ταῖς πολιτείαις ἢ τυραννίς. 2, 5: σφόδρ' ἀν' ἡγούμην καὶ τὸς φοβερὸν τὸν Φίλιππον καὶ θαυμαστόν, εἰ τὰ δίκαια πράττονθ' ἑώρων ἡδυσμένον. 9, 16: τὸ δ' εὐσεβὲς καὶ τὸ δίκαιον ἂν τ' ἐπὶ μικροῦ τις ἂν τ' ἐπὶ μείζονος παραβαίῃ, τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχει δύναμιν. 9, 26: πόλεις ἐπὶ Θράκης ἔω, ἅς ἀπάσας οὕτως ὡμῶς ἀνῆρκεν, ὥστε μηδ' εἰ πώποτ' ᾤκήθησαν προσελθόντ' εἶναι ῥᾶδιον εἰπεῖν. Very much alive are these ancients. A few months ago Deschanel quoted in an impassioned speech a passage from the prophecy of Darius in the Persae 821-2:

ὑβρις γὰρ ἐξανθοῦσ' ἐκάρπωσε στάχυν
αἵτης, ὅθεν πάγκλαυτον ἐξαμᾶ θέρος.

In a Bryn Mawr doctoral dissertation on *The Spurious Speeches of the Lysianic Corpus*, ANGELA C. DARKOW main-

tains that there is no satisfactory proof that Lysias or, in fact, any of the orators of the Attic canon wrote speeches for court—the latter an audacious thesis—and therefore the objection to the disputed speeches of Lysias that they are unsuited to the practical business of the law, falls to the ground; and that the deviations from Lysianic or even classical usage may have their *raison d'être* in the *ethopoiia* for which Lysias was so renowned. The small number of extant speeches out of the portentously long list attributed to Lysias is in the eyes of the writer a proof that a severe censorship had been exercised by the ancient critics and is *prima facie* evidence in favour of the genuineness of the whole corpus, despite an occasional *εἰ γνήσιος*. Lysias, it seems, was no advocate employed in real cases but a literary artist and it is only as a literary artist that he appears in Plato's *Phaedrus* and as such he must be studied by us. According to Miss DARKOW Lysias gains rather than loses by this change of base. The note of actuality which some critics have recognized in such specimens of art as the wonderful First Oration is merely the effect of consummate skill. Proceeding on these assumptions, or what some people would consider assumptions, Miss DARKOW has carefully summarized and discussed the opinions of a number of scholars, for the speeches of Lysias have been fair game for the athetizers, Tray, Blanch and Sweetheart. Indeed there are only six of the thirty-one, the genuineness of which has not been impugned by dissertation-mongers and programmatists; and as Professor Sanders to whose guidance Miss DARKOW makes ample acknowledgment is a dog-fancier of high degree, an authority on the *Κυνηγετικός*, a specialist to whom I myself have appealed when attacked by a malapert critic in the matter of a Pindaric interpretation (A. J. P. XXVIII 110), I shall be forgiven for quoting the Xenophontean example I have imbedded in my S. C. G. 97: τὰ κυνίδια . . . κυβιστῶν καὶ ἄλλα πολλὰ μανθάνει, especially as I gain thereby an opportunity to mend my translation and illustrate the origin of neuter plural and verb singular: *all puppydom* (τὰ κυνίδια) *learns to turn somersaults*; and intellectual somersaults are diverting rather than irritating. Read what Gomperz, the aged, has said of the youthful Bruns (A. J. P. XXIII 471). In all matters that involve the consultation of authorities I am οὐτ' ἐν λόγῳ οὐτ' ἐν ἀριθμῷ for I am somewhat in the case of Lysias' ἀδύνατος, if ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἀδυνάτου is by Lysias—but being like Dogberry, a householder, I wonder how Lysias made his living after he lost all his property under the Thirty; for if there is scant evidence—as it seems to Miss DARKOW—that he followed the lucrative business of speech-writing, there is still less evidence that he took up the other and exceedingly lucrative business of teaching the young idea how to shoot the rapids of popular oratory.

The result of Miss DARKOW's studies is to let down the bars. The *χάρις* test which Dionysius applies is too vague (A. J. P. XXXIV 488). What *χάρις*, which Miss DARKOW translates 'charm', is to one may not be *χάρις* to another. Another test, that of *καθαρότης*, comes to naught by reason of Lysias' *ethopoia*, as we have just seen. This is quite in line with Professor Sanders' contention as to the occasional use of *ἀν* with the future in Plato (A. J. P. XXXVII 42-61). Grammatical propriety is deliberately sacrificed to dramatic propriety. The man in the street is made to speak his own language. He says not 'tisn't' but 'tain't' and, in the eyes of the purist, Anstey's Tinted Venus becomes a tainted Venus, and the *χάρις* is lost. One recalls Bekker's famous characteristic of Cobet's Homeric criticism: 'Die seele seiner kritik ist nun einmal purismus, straffzügiger, scheuklapseliger purismus.'—Hom. Blätter II 54. In his critical introduction to his ed. of Lysias Cobet is on safer ground. The sleuth-hounds of grammar and diction have nosed out many such things in Xenophon, and who has not yielded to the temptation in the region of *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα*? (A. J. P. XXVII 485.)

But, though I am painfully aware of the physical limitations (A. J. P. XXXVII 232) that bar my serious pursuance of the subject, Lysias is to me a name to conjure with, and I hope I shall be pardoned for recalling the part the son of Kephalos has played in my life—for my living has also been my life, as it is with all real teachers of Greek. Yes—the name itself has interested me, and some years ago, forgetting my favourite quotation 'non omnis aetas, Lyde, ludo convenit', I set up a mock defence of Teichmüller's identification of the Dionysodoros of Plato's Euthydemus with Lysias. Lysias, I said, is evidently the short for Lysanias, the name of his grandfather, and I propounded the equation $\Lambda\upsilon\sigma\alpha\nu\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma = \Lambda\upsilon\alpha\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma = \Delta\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu\upsilon\sigma\omicron\varsigma$ —a winged word which was promptly hawked at by a mousing owl of a German reviewer.¹ My first acquaintance with Lysias goes back to 1850, when I bought out of my scant allowance a copy of the Berlin ed. of the Attic orators, to find alas! as I went on in my studies that I had been swindled by somebody. A leaf of the *Παναθηναϊκός* of Isokrates had taken the place of a leaf of the *Περὶ παραπρεσβείας* of Demosthenes. This is no solitary experience in the case of German editions, and I have occasionally registered a complaint (e. g. A. J. P. VIII 119). The mention of those Berlin days calls up the image of Johannes Franz (*Φρασικλῆς*) who admitted me to his Schola Graeca and gave me the name *Χρυσοβραχίων*. He too is a Lysianic reminis-

¹ A. J. P. XXXV 364.

cence, for he edited Lysias in the year in which I was born. For years my favourite edition was the pretty pocket-edition by Westermann, which I proceeded to disfigure by marginal and other notes. It perished, to my sorrow, in the flood of water turned upon my library at the time of the Johns Hopkins fire. The scholar to whom I owe my first introduction to Lysias was Rauchenstein, the same who helped me in my first studies of Pindar. It may seem strange to some that the same man should have been an enthusiastic student of two authors so diverse as Lysias and Pindar (A. J. P. XXIV 108), but such a one has never considered the processes of wine-taster and tea-taster. Somewhere in the 'to-hu bo-hu' of my MSS there is a Greek exercise-book, based on Lysias, a safer model than Xenophon. Fifty years ago when a local Sir Oracle said to me that his test of Greek scholarship was a mastery of Pindar and Athenaeus, I ventured to remark that my test was an honest enjoyment of Lysias. So much of our enjoyment is factitious. In a series of studies entitled 'On the Steps of the Bema' I made a large place for Lysias, and illustrated the chapter 'Anarchy *plus* a street constable' (a Carlylese title) by the Third Oration. In those early days there was no American edition of Lysias and when at last one appeared, I wrote to the Nation an angry protest against the untimely birth, a protest which led to a correspondence with Mr. Garrison and subsequent work for our leading critical journal, as I have recorded in the Jubilee Number (July 8, 1915). There are other American editions in one of which there is or was a misleading note on the memorable asyndeton at the end of Or. XII. Of Morgan's excellent edition I have said something but not enough (A. J. P. XVI 396). One of the few emendations that I proposed he accepted (VII 14), but alas! I found afterwards that I had been anticipated, and a like fate befell another emendation by which I got rid of the impossible ἐλεύσεσθαι (XXII 11). See A. J. P. III 228. Professor Adams has had his meed of praise and thanks from all American lovers of Lysias. His edition is an admirable Praeparatio Rhetorica for the study of the Greek orators. In the years of my Olympiad in which the Attic orators formed the centre about which our studies revolved, Lysias was a conspicuous figure. The general scheme was suggested by Dionysius of Halicarnassus who had rashly maintained that in certain spheres it would be hard to distinguish between Lysias and Demosthenes (A. J. P. XXV 357). In the private orations the subjects minimize differences but even there the differences between the orators can be brought to the consciousness of the student by methods, some of which were unknown to the ancient critics. The very passages cited by Dionysius, De admiranda vi, p. 985, are wide apart, and comparative studies of orations by different orators in handling like themes formed a

good ἀλυνδήθρα for the young horsemen and the old hobby-rider. I do not repent me of the exercises imposed on the students of style, and a noteworthy result was the dissertation of Kirk, which deals with the private orations of Demosthenes and which has found favour in the eyes of those who know (A. J. P. XVII 391; XIX 234). One Seminary exercise consisted of a comparison between Lysias III, already referred to, and Demosthenes LIV, much admired by most students of Demosthenes, but vilipended or rather vilified by Bruns (A. J. P. XXV 356 fn.), cocksurest of the cocksure, who made the fatal slip of calling it ὑπὲρ Κόνωνος instead of κατὰ Κόνωνος, a parallel to the intelligent juryman, who was puzzled by the recurring words 'plaintiff' and 'defendant'. The dissertation of Devries on the Ethopoia of Lysias belongs to the early days of the seminary and Holmes's Index to Lysias projected on a plan, which seemed to preclude the mistakes made in so many indexes, is due to the same environment. In this Index, as Miss DARKOW remarks, Holmes has included the Ἐρωτικός of the Phaedrus. Vahlen's advocacy of Lysianic authorship stemmed the tide which had been running the other way, but Miss DARKOW thinks that Weinstock has opened the channel again, and made Plato responsible for the speech. Old Gorgias called Plato a new Archilochos, but to tell the truth, it seems hardly fair even for an Archilochos to create a *pastiche* (A. J. P. XXXV 231) and treat it as if it were the genuine work of the author ridiculed (A. J. P. XXVI 243). But the Zeus of Greek literature was capable of sophistic proceedings in his dealings with the sophists.

When the wielders of Thor's hammer, foretold of Heinrich Heine descendant of the prophets of old, had made some progress in destroying the temples of Christ, the son of an un-German god, there was some discussion among the followers of an un-German creed as to the course to be pursued after the war, whether to restore what used to be called in pseudo-classic style the sacred fanes that had been demolished or to let them remain to be a perpetual reminder of the ruin that had been wrought. It is an old problem, a problem which the Greeks had solved in their way. But what has called forth this *Brief Mention* is not the historical parallel but the impressive lesson as to the hopelessness of literary fame—a theme on which Bagehot and Stapfer and many others have enlarged. It is then not the case of the Cathedral of Reims but the case of Isokrates that I have in mind. If there ever was an elaborate piece of literary work it is the Panegyricus of Isokrates and yet a certain champion of Hellenism, who had taken all Greekdom for his province has actually reported

the action of the Greeks as recorded somewhere by somebody. I am going to be as vague as he was and content myself with transcribing Isok. Panegy. 156: διὸ καὶ τοὺς Ἴωνας ἀξίον ἐπαινεῖν ὅτι τῶν ἐμπρησθέντων ἱερῶν ἐπηράσαντ' εἴ τινας κινήσειαν ἢ πάλιν εἰς τάρχαϊα καταστῆσαι βουληθεῖεν, οὐκ ἀπορούντες, πόθεν ἐπισκευάσωσιν, ἀλλ' ἔν' ὑπόμνημα τοῖς ἐπιγιγνομένοις ἢ τῆς τῶν βαρβάρων ἀσεβείας, καὶ μηδεὶς πιστεύῃ τοῖς τοιαῦτ' εἰς τὰ τῶν θεῶν ἐξαμαρτεῖν τολμῶσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ φυλάττωνται καὶ δεδίωσιν, ὁρῶντες αὐτοὺς οὐ μόνον τοῖς σώμασιν ἡμῶν ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ἀναθήμασι πολεμήσαντας. However as the Germans resent the title of 'barbarians' so freely bestowed on them, they might find some consolation in applying to the strategy of the Allies Dem. 4, 40: οὐδὲν δ' ἀπολείπετε, ὥσπερ οἱ βάρβαροι πυκτεύουσιν, οὕτω πολεμεῖν Φιλίππῳ. καὶ γὰρ ἐκείνων ὁ πληγεὶς αἰεὶ τῆς πληγῆς ἔχεται, κἂν ἐτέρωσε πατάξῃς, ἐκείσ' εἰσιν αἱ χεῖρες, κτέ. But all military criticisms are open to revision and retort.

Nihil quod tetigit non ornavit. In the Corrigenda of this number (p. 462), Professor Gildersleeve refers to Jebb's misquotation of the famous line of Goldsmith's epitaph. It may be interesting to note that Jebb was not the first sinner. Dean Stanley was guilty of the same offence, and, if I mistake not, it was he that led Jebb astray. In the fifth edition of the Historical Memorials of Westminster Abbey, an edition which 'is printed from the copy left by the Dean at his death, and containing his final corrections and additions,' there still appears the following (p. 279): 'But the whole inscription shows the supreme position which Goldsmith occupied in English literature; and one expression, at least, has passed from it into the proverbial Latin of mankind—*Nihil tetigit quod non ornavit.*' To this passage is appended the following note: '*Nullum scribendi genus quod tetigit non ornavit.* (Epitaph.)' Compare with this the words of Jebb. Essays and Addresses, p. 503: "Goldsmith," he said, "was a man who, whatever he wrote, always did it better than any other man could do"—a judgment which stands in the Latin of his famous epitaph on Goldsmith as *nihil tetigit quod non ornavit*, "he touched nothing which he did not adorn." Jebb was too good a scholar to have written *nihil tetigit quod non ornavit*, unless he had had the above passage of the Memorials before him and had really believed the line to be part of the epitaph.

If G. Birbeck Hill (Boswell's Life of Johnson, vol. iii, p. 82, footnote 3) is to be trusted, Dean Stanley originally perpetrated the following note on his misquotation: 'Professor Conington calls my attention to the fact that, if this were a genuine classical expression, it would be *ornaret*. The slight

mistake proves that it is Johnson's own.' The first edition of Dean Stanley's work is not accessible to me. In the second edition, the author tried to rectify his blunder by the substitution of the footnote cited above, and this footnote was retained in subsequent editions. But the attempt was only partially successful. To say nothing of the new inaccuracy of citation—the words *scribendi genus* ought to be enclosed in brackets to show that they do not actually appear in the epitaph—the author persisted in making the epitaph responsible for the origin of a proverbial expression the Latinity of which is doubtful and is a perversion of that of the original.

The original seems to have emanated from the pen of Boswell, the biographer of Dr. Johnson. In his account of the year 1763, Boswell gives a sketch of Goldsmith in which occurs the following remark: 'No man had the art of displaying with more advantage as a writer, whatever literary acquisitions he made. "*Nihil quod tetigit non ornavit.*"' To this remark, the author appends the footnote: "See his Epitaph in Westminster Abbey, written by Dr. Johnson." It seems likely that Dean Stanley had this passage in mind, but that he quoted from memory, with the resultant unhappy transposition of the words *quod* and *tetigit*.

Though Boswell, to warrant his own estimate of Goldsmith, refers specifically to the epitaph, there can be little doubt that he was but giving Latin expression to a favorite dictum of Johnson's. Cradock, in his *Literary and Miscellaneous Memoirs*, vol. iv, p. 286, tells us that 'Johnson (when Goldsmith was absent), would frequently say, "Why, sir, whatever that man touches he adorns."' This harmonizes with another statement of his, which has been used by Hill, l. c., to show that Johnson was merely repeating himself in his epitaph on Goldsmith. The statement is this (*Memoirs*, vol. I, 231): 'When a bookseller ventured to say something rather slightly of Dr. Goldsmith, Johnson retorted:—"Sir, Goldsmith never touches any subject but he adorns it."'

A word or two remain to be said with regard to the dictionaries of quotations. At least three of the most widely used works of this kind cite the line of the epitaph, *nullum quod tetigit non ornavit*, to which is added the translation, 'He touched nothing that he did not adorn.' There is double ground for dissatisfaction with this. The Latin is not quotable, and the translation does not fit the citation. The Latin, as has been shown, is an adaptation by Johnson of his own dictum to the needs of his epitaph on Goldsmith. The English, it will be noticed, is a translation of Boswell's adaptation of the dictum to his own particular requirements. The obvious remedy would be to do away with the line of the epitaph in the cyclopedias of quotations and to insert in its place the

version of Boswell, which would have the triple merit of being eminently quotable, of removing the present incongruity between the Latin text and the English translation, and of eliminating, in a large measure, the danger of misquotation.¹

C. W. E. MILLER.

¹The timeliness of the above remarks is apparent from a very recent misquotation, to which Professor Mustard has just called my attention: 'And whether he <Dr. Mackail> is explaining the *Pervigilium Veneris*, translating Virgil or Homer, or imaginatively describing Virgil's outlook on his native land, it may justly be said of him, *Nihil tetigit quod non ornavit*.' (Proceedings of the Classical Association, Jan. 1917, Vol. XIV, p. 103.)

CORRIGENDA.

P. 223, l. 18. Schikaneder wrote 'Führt *Liebe ihn* zur Pflicht'.—H. C. G. B. It was impossible at the time to verify my quotation and a lapse of memory after sixty-five years is pardonable—perhaps. As time goes on, I take less and less comfort from other people's blunders. Still my slip is venial when one recalls Jebb's misquotation of the famous epitaph of Johnson on Goldsmith which appears, and that in an essay on Johnson, *Essays and Addresses* p. 503, where 'nullum (sc. genus) quod tetigit, non ornavit' appears as 'nihil tetigit quod non ornavit' (ornaret?)—following carelessly and ungrammatically the familiar translation, 'touched nothing that he did not adorn'.

P. 227, l. 3 from bottom. Before 'of this sacrilegious encroachment' insert 'in specimens'.

P. 339, l. 28. Professor Hutton is not responsible for the identification of the Southern cause in the Civil War with that of Prussian Junkerdom. The pellet was aimed at the Northern press and its file-leader, the *New York Times*, and I regret that it hit an innocent bystander, who has naturally entered a protest.

B. L. G.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. G. E. Stechert & Co., 151-155 W. 25th St., New York, for material furnished.

ENGLISH AND AMERICAN.

Beardslee (John Walter). Use of $\Phi\tau\sigma\iota\varsigma$ in fifth century Greek literature. *Univ. of Chicago Press*, 1917. 75 c.

Bright (Ja. Wilson). An Anglo-Saxon reader; with notes, a complete glossary, a chapter on versification and an outline of Anglo-Saxon grammar. 4th ed. New York, *Holt*. 79 + 385 pp., 12°, \$1.75 net.

British School at Athens, (The) Annual. No. 21. Sessions 1914-1915, 1915-1916. Ryl. 8°, 10 × 6½. *Macmillan*, 1917. 21s. net.

Byrne (Maria J.) Prolegomena to an edition of the works of Decimus Magnus Ausonius. 9 × 6, 110 pp. *Milford*, 1917. 5s. 6d. net.

Carroll (John S.) In Patria: an exposition of Dante's Paradiso. 8°, 579 pp. *Hodder & S.*, 1917. 10s. 6d. net.

Caesar (Caius Julius). The Gallic war; with an English tr. by H. J. Edwards. New York, *Putnam*. 22 + 619 pp., 16°. (Loeb Classical Lib.) \$1.50 net; leather, \$2 net.

D'Alton (J. F.) Horace and his age: a study in historical background. Cr. 8°, 308 pp. *Longmans*, 1917. 6s. net.

Dio's Roman history; with an English tr. by Earnest Cary. On the basis of the version of Herb. Baldwin Foster. In gv. V. 5. New York, *Putnam*. 525 pp., 16°. (Loeb Classical Lib.) \$1.50 net.

Dutton (Emily Helen). Studies in Greek prepositional phrases. Menasha, Wis., *G. Banta*, 1916. 9 + 211 pp., 8°, \$1.50 net.

Erasmus. The Complaint of Peace. Tr. from the Latin of Erasmus, A. D. 1559. Ed. by Alexander Grieve. Cr. 8°, 125 pp. *Headley*, 1917. 2s. 6d. net.

Frazer (J. G.) Studies in Greek scenery, legend and history. Selected from his commentary on Pausanias' "Description of Greece". Cr. 8°, 429 pp. *Macmillan*, 1917. 5s. net.

Gawayne (Sir) and the Green Knight; re-edited from Cotton MS. by R. Morris. New York, *G. E. Stechert* (n. d.). Anastatic reprint. 20 + 124 pp., 8°, \$2.50 net.

Le Grand (Philippe E.) New Greek comedy; tr. by J. Loeb; with an introd. by J. Williams White. (Loeb Classical Lib.) 8°, xix, 547 pp. *Putnam*, 1917. \$4.50 net.

Lucan. De bello civili; liber viii; ed. by J. P. Postgate. 16°, x, cxii, 146, 16 pp. *Putnam*, 1917. \$1.

Palmer (Harold E.) The Scientific study and teaching of languages. 8°, 328 pp. *Harrap*, 1917. 10s. 6d. net.

Plotinus. The Ethical treatises: being the treatises of the first Ennead, w. Porphyry's Life of Plotinus and the Preller-Ritter Extracts. Tr. by Stephen MacKenna. In 4 vols. Fol. pp. 158. *P. Lee Warner*, 1917. 16s. net.

Rippmann (Wa.) The sounds of spoken English. New version. New York, *Dutton* (n. d.). 7 + 232 pp., 12°, \$1.25 net.

Seneca, ad Lucilium epistulae morales; with an English tr. by R. M. Gummere. In 3 v. V. I. New York, *Putnam*. (Loeb Classical Lib.) 15 + 467 pp., 16°, \$1.50 net.

Stidston (Russell Osborne). The use of ye in the function of thou in Middle-English Literature; rev. by Arth. G. Kennedy. *Leland Stanford Junior Univ.* 95 pp., 4°, pap., 75 c.

Westaway (K. M.) The Original element in Plautus. *Camb. Univ. Pr.*, 1917. Cr. 8°, 256 pp., 2s. 6d. net.

Year's Work in Classical Studies, 1916. Ed. by Stephen Gaselee. *J. Murray*, 1917. 8°, 115 pp., 2s. 6d. net.

FRENCH, ITALIAN, SPANISH.

Alighieri Dante, La Divina Commedia con note a cura di Guido Vitali. Livorno, *Paradiso*. 130 pp., con 3 tav. L. 1.20.

Barbieri (Federico). Le rime e le commedie meneghine di Carlo Maria Maggi. Milano. 136 pp. L. 3.

Bloch (Oscar). Les Parlers des Vosges méridionales. 10 fr.

Cejador y Frauca (Julio). Historia de la lengua y literatura castellanas, comprendidos los autores hispano-americanos, tomo VI (Epoca del siglo XVIII: 1701-1829), un vol. en Quarto, de 466 págs. Pes. 10.

Maspéro (Gaston). Introduction à l'étude de la phonétique égyptienne. 15 fr.

— Atlas linguistique des Vosges méridionales. 22 fr. 50.

Pernot (Hubert). Grammaire du grec moderne. Langue parlée. 5 fr.

Prati (Angelico). L'Italiano e il parlare della Valsugana, 2a ediz. Roma, IX. 80. L. 2.

Ripert (Émile). La Renaissance provençale 1800-1860. 10 fr.

Sandalgian (Joseph). Histoire documentaire de l'Arménie des âges du paganisme (1410 av.-305 apr. J. Chr.). Roma, 2 vol., con tav. L. 16.

Tanqueray (F. J.) L'Évolution du verbe anglo-français, XIII^e & XIV^e siècles. 25 fr.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

American Journal of Archaeology. Second Series. Vol. XXI. No. 3. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1917.

Armstrong (Mary Emma). The Significance of Certain Colors in Roman Ritual. Johns Hopkins University Diss. Menasha, Wis., *George Banta Publishing Co.*, 1917.

Biblical Archaeology, The Society of. Proceedings. Vol. XXXIX. Part 5. London, *The Offices of the Society*, 1917.

Census of Manufacturers, 1914. Abstract of the Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Sam L. Rogers, Director. Washington, *Government Printing Office*, 1917. 65 c.

Cooper (Lane). Greek Genius and Its Influence. Select Essays and Extracts. Ed. with an Introduction. New Haven, *Yale University Press*, 1917. \$3.50.

D'Alton (J. F.) Horace and his Age. London, *Longmans, Green & Co.*, 1917. \$2 net.

Darkow (Angela C.) The Spurious Speeches in the Lysianic Corpus. Bryn Mawr Diss. Bryn Mawr, Pa., 1917.

Deutsch (M. E.) Suetonius and Caesar's German Campaign. T. A. P. A. Vol. XLVII, 1916.

Fox (W. Sherwood). Greek Inscriptions in the Royal Ontario Museum. (Reprinted from the American Journal of Philology, Vol. XXXVIII 3.)

Garrison (Fielding H.) The Greek Cult of the Dead. Reprint from the Annals of Medical History.

Hatfield (J. T.) Lessing's Feeling for Classical Rhythms. Journal of English and Germanic Philology, Vol. XVI, No. 3. July, 1917.

Inter-America. Vol. I, Nos. 3 and 4, 1917. New York, *Doubleday, Page & Co.*

Keidel (George C.) The Early Life of Professor Elliott. Washington, D. C., Privately printed, 1917.

Loeb Classical Library, The.

Caesar, The Gallic War, with an English translation by H. J. Edwards.

Dio's Roman History, by Earnest Cary. Vol. V.

Seneca ad Lucilium Epistulae Morales, with an English translation by Richard M. Gummere. Vol. I.

Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome. Vol. I. School of Classical Studies, 1915-1916. Bergamo, *Istituto Italiano d'Arti Grafiche*, 1917.

Murray (Augustus T.) Plot and Character of Greek Tragedy (T. A. P. Ass., XLVII, 1916).

Oldfather (W. A.) Studies in the History and Topography of Locris. I and II. Reprinted from the American Journal of Archaeology, Second Series, Vol. XX (1916), No. 1 and 2.

— Addenda on Larymna and Cyrtone. Reprinted from the American Journal of Archaeology, Second Series, Vol. XV (1916), No. 3.

— Review of Vollmer's *Poetae Latini Minores* and *Zum Homerus Latinus*. C. P. XI 2, April, 1916.

— The Fine Arts and the Classics. *The Classical Weekly*, Vol. VIII, No. 9, 1914.

— Roman Comedy. *The Classical Weekly*, Vol. VII. No. 28, 1914.

Reider (Joseph). *Prolegomena to a Greek-Hebrew and Hebrew-Greek Index to Aquila*. (A thesis of the Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning.) Philadelphia, 1916.

Revista de la Facultad de Letras y Ciencias. Universidad de la Habana. Vol. XXV. Num. 1. Julio y Agosto de 1917.

Sedgefield (W. J.) *Selections from the Old English Bede with Text and Vocabulary . . . and a Skeleton Outline of Old English Accidence*. Manchester (England), *At the University Press*; London, New York, etc., *Longmans, Green & Co.*, 1917. \$1.20 net.

Sepulcrum Ioannis Pascoli. Carmen Francisci Sofia-Alessio Radicenensis in Certamine Hoeufftiano praemio aureo donatum. Accedunt X Carmina laudata. Amstelodami, *Apud Io. Mullerum*, MCMXVII.

Shakespeare. Yale Edition. New Haven, *Yale University Press*; London, *Humphrey Milford*, 1917.

— *Much Ado About Nothing*. Ed. by Tucker Brooke. 50 c.

— *Romeo and Juliet*. Ed. by Willard Higley Durham. 50 c.

— *King Lear*. Ed. by William Phelps. 50 c.

— *Hamlet*. Ed. by Jack Randall Crawford. 50 c.

Shields (Emily Ledyard). *The Cult of Lesbos*. J. H. U. Diss. Menasha (Wis.), *Geo. Banta Pub. Co.*, 1917.

Stuart (Donald Clive). *The Origin of Greek Tragedy in the Light of Dramatic Technique*. Extracted from *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, Vol. XLVII, 1916.

Studies in Philology, Vol. XIV, Nos. 3 and 4. July and Oct., 1917. *University of N. C.*, Chapel Hill, N. C.

Sturtevant (E. H.) *Linguistic Change. An Introduction to the Historical Study of Language*. Chicago, *University of Chicago Press*, 1917. \$1 net. Postage extra.

Trever (Albert Augustus). *A History of Greek Economic Thought*. (Univ. of Chicago Diss.) Chicago, *The University of Chicago Press*, 1916.

Tuttle (E. H.) *Notes on Romanic e and i*. (Reprinted from *Modern Philology*, Vol. XV, No. 3, 1917.)

Tyler (Lyon G.) *The South and Germany*. Reprint from *William and Mary College Quarterly*, July, 1917.

Value of the Classics. Princeton, N. J., *Princeton University Press*, 1917. \$1.50.

Wiener (Leo). *Contributions toward a History of Arabico-Gothic Culture*. Vol. I. New York, *The Neale Publishing Co.*, 1917. \$3.50 net.

INDEX TO VOLUME XXXVIII.

- ABBOTT, FRANK FROST. The Pronunciation of a Final Consonant in a Latin Word-Group, 73-81
 Review of Ernout's Textes Latins Archaïques, 208-209
 Achalme on German Science, 223
 Adrianople, Classical remains in, 215
 Aeschylus, Eum. 506 sqq., 161
 Persae 821-2, 455
 ALLINSON, FRANCIS G. Review of Fox's Greek and Roman Mythology, 88-93
 Antalcidas, 449
 Apophony and Rhyme Words in Vulgar Latin Onomatopoeias, 265-284
 Apuleius, Apologia, Butler and Owen's (rev.), 204-205
 De Magia, Marchesi's (rev.), 203-204
 Life of, 317-18
 Met. 81, 6-91, 8, 452
 Arden Shakespeare (Am. ed.), 445
 Ariston of Chios, 450
 Aristophanes, Aves 1313 (em.), 232
 Religious Burlesque in, 176-185
 Aristotelian Pneuma, 213
 Arminius balladry, 449
 in Tacitus, 451
 Aryan *pitar-* and Dravidian **pitar-*, 315-316
 Asclepiades Myrleanus, 452
 Attic inscriptions, Johnson-Woodward, 108
 Orators, Political types in, 103
 Ausonius, Byrne's (rev.), 320-321
 BLAKE, FRANK R. Reduplication in Tagalog, 425-431
 BLOOMFIELD, MAURICE. Some Cruces in Vedic Text, Grammar and Interpretation, 1-18
 Books Received, 122-124; 235-236; 347-348; 464-465
 Boswell on Goldsmith, 461
 Bouchier's Syria as a Roman Province, 321-322
 Bréal, Michel, on Homer, 111-113
 Breul's Goliard Songbook of the XIth C. (mentioned), 117
 Brief Mention, 110-115; 221-227; 333-342; 454-461
 Burlesque, Religious, in Aristophanes and elsewhere, 176-185
 Bywater, Ingram, Memorial of, 392-410
 Caesar's Commentaries a re-publication, 329
 CANTER, H. V. Rhetorical Elements in Livy's Direct Speeches, 125-151
 CARNOY, ALBERT J. Apophony and Rhyme Words in Vulgar Latin Onomatopoeias, 265-284
 Carpenter's Ethics of Euripides (mentioned), 340
 Catullus, The Brescian Codex of, 98-99
 Headings of his poems, 220
 Cicero, N. D. 2, 33, 83, 218
 Orator, Analysis of, 218
 Pro M. Tullio, 452
 Ciris, Text of, 216
 Cocchia's Lucio Apuleio (rev.), 317-318
 Columbia University Shakespearean Studies, 93-66
 COOK, ALBERT S. Petrarch and the Wine of Meroë, 312-314
 Cooper's, Lane, Concordance to Horace (rev.), 323-328
 Correspondence, Fay to Petersen, 228-232
 Corrigenda, 462
 Cyprian, Life of, 103

- Darkow's Spurious Speeches of the Lysianic Corpus (mentioned), 455-459
- Demosthenes 4. 40, 460
- Olynthiacs and Philippics and the present war, 455
- Denominative Verbs, 219
- Dio Chrysostomus, Or. XI, 108
- Diocles of Carystus, 449
- Diodorus of Tarsus, 103
- Delos, Architects and contractors at, 105
- Dragoumis' Man of Athens (mentioned), 333
- Dravidian **pitar-*, Aryan *pitar-* and, 314-315
- EBELING, HERMAN L. Report of Hermes, 213-218; 447-451
- EDGERTON, FRANKLIN. Review of The Sanskrit Poems of Mayūra, 435-441
- English, Historical Present in, 341-342
- Ernout's Textes Latins Archaiques (rev.), 208-209
- Epicurean polemic against Providence, 453
- Equus Troianus on the Roman Stage, 330
- Errata, 342
- Etruscan text on mummy cloth, 450
- Euripides Hel. (emended), 102
- Ion 1424, 101
- I. A., Critical Notes on, 340
- Archaism in, Manning's (mentioned), 339
- Chorus in, Phoutrides' (mentioned), 341
- Ethics of, Carpenter's (mentioned), 340
- FAY, EDWIN W. Sobriquet and Stem, 83-87
- Correspondence. Answer to Petersen, 228-232
- Final Consonant in Latin, 73-81
- Fowler's Virgil's Gathering of the Clans (rev.), 209-211
- FOX, W. SHERWOOD. Greek Inscriptions in the Royal Ontario Museum, 304-311; 411-424
- Fox's Greek and Roman Mythology (rev.), 88-93
- FRENCH, J. C. Notice of Arden Shakespeare (Am. ed.), 445
- FROTHINGHAM, ARTHUR L. Vediovis, A Volcanic God, 370-391
- German Emperor and Greek, 455
- GILDERSLEEVE, BASIL L. An Oxford Scholar, 392-410
- Paulus Silentarius, 23-72
- See *Brief Mention*.
- Glossary, St. Gall, 349-369
- Goethe's Estimate of the Greek and Latin Writers, 118
- Graffito, a misunderstood, 104
- GRAVES, T. S. Review of Columbia University Shaksperian Studies, 93-96
- Greek Inscriptions in the Royal Ontario Museum, 304-311; 411-424
- Greek Law, Prosecution of Lifeless Things and Animals in, 151-175; 285-303
- Studies in Germany, 454-455
- Greek words:
- καλύπτω*, Et. of, 219;
- ναύστης* = *ναύτης*, 214;
- τρέπειν*, to cause one to change one's mind, 215;
- ποιεῖν* and *πράττειν*, 217;
- προῖεράσθαι*, 452; *σάτυροι* = goat-demons, 218; *τίτυροι* = ram-demons, 218.
- Grotius, Note on his *Mare liberum*, 225
- Gummere's Seneca (rev.), 446
- Hannibal, Dialogue between Scipio Africanus and, 213
- Hellespont, The name, 109
- Herculanean Papyri, 219-220
- Hercynian Forest really Silva Marciana, 330
- Hermes, Report of, 213-218; 447-452
- Hermes' lyre in Sophocles' *Ἰχνηρεταί*, 214
- Herodotus, the physician, 214
- Heron, Ptolemy and, 216
- HEWITT, JOSEPH WILLIAM. Religious Burlesque in Aristophanes and elsewhere, 176-185
- Hexameter, Penthemimeral caesura in, 215
- Hippias in Xenophon and in Plato, 219
- Hippocrates de arte not by Protagoras, 448
- Hippolytus of Rome, Papyrus fragments of, 100

- Historical Present in English, 341-342
 Homer, Bréal on, 111-113
 Homeric Poems, Disposition of Spoil in, 186-195
 Homeric Word Rhythm, 106
 Horace, Concordance to, Lane Cooper's (rev.), 323-328
 a convert, 220
 Ode I, 34, 448
 Sat. I, I, 61 (em.), 330
 Second Book classified, 214
 Sermones I, 10, 44, 194-199
 Housman's Manilius (rev.), 206-207
 HUMPHREYS, MILTON W. Review of Winter's Nicolaus Steno, 201-203
 Hutton's Thucydides and History (mentioned), 338
 HYDE, WALTER WOODBURN. Prosecution of Lifeless Things and Animals in Greek Law, 151-175; 285-303
 'Τροθήκαι literature, 451
 Isocrates 4, 156, 460
 13, 12, 217
 Jackson's Memorial of Ingram Bywater, 392-410
 Julia Domna, 103
 Justinus, Pompeius Trogus and, 19-41
 Juvenal, VI and IV, Analysis of, 106
 VII, 134, 220
 Keller's Goethe's Estimate of the Greek and Latin writers (mentioned), 118
 KNAPP, CHARLES. Molle atque facetum, 194-199
 Laberius, A new verse of, 214
 Latin, Vulgar, Apophony and Rhyme Words in, 265-284
 Latin:
 Historical Infinitive, 100
 Poetical Inscriptions, 449
 Pronunciation of a Final Consonant, 73-81
 Synizesis in, 218
 Latin words:
 Adipalis, 217; Antium, 218; in potestatem fuisse, 331; stlattaria, 220; urbes, urbis in Vergil, 220.
 Lifeless Things and Animals, Prosecution of in Greek Law, 151-175; 285-303
 LINDSAY, W. M. The St. Gall Glossary, 349-369
 LITCHFIELD, H. W. Review of Ernout's Lucrèce, De la Nature, livre quatrième, 322-323
 Livy's Direct Speeches, Rhetorical Elements in, 125-151
 accuracy vindicated, 329
 Epitome of, 451
 Lucian, Peripatetic source of his *περί τοῦ μὴ βραδύως πιστεῖν διαβολῇ*, 107
 Lucian's Phalaridea, 450
 Lucretius, Ernout's (rev.), 322-323
 Lysianic Corpus, Darkow's Spurious Speeches of the (mentioned), 455-459
 MAGOFFIN, R. V. D. Review of Cuq, Locaux affectés à l'habitation dans la Rome impériale, 96-98
 Dottin, Les anciens peuples de l'Europe, 443-445
 Report of Revue de Philologie, 100-109; 329-330
 Marchesi's Apuleius de Magia (rev.), 203-204
 Marcus' *εἰς αὐτόν*, Epigram in, 217
 Martial 5, 77 and 9, 95, 220
 Mayūra, Sanskrit Poems of, 435-441
 Menander's Epitrepontes, New Fragments of, 213
 Perikeiromene, 214
 Meroë, The Wine of, Petrarch and, 312-314
 Meteorology in antiquity, 447
 MILLER, C. W. E. *Nihil quod tetigit non ornavit*, 460-462
 Report of Rheinisches Museum, 106-109
 Review of Lane Cooper's Concordance to Horace, 323-328
 Molle atque facetum, 194-199
 Muretus and the Lusitania, 334
 MURRAY, A. T. Disposition of Spoil in Homeric Poems, 186-193
 MUSTARD, W. P. Brief Mention of Breul's Goliard Songbook, 117
 Gnesotto's Francisci Barbari De Re Uxoriam, 342
 Keller, Goethe's Estimate of the Greek and Latin Writers, 118

- Stampini's Studi, 116
 Thayer's Influence of Horace, 116
 Ussani's Satire di Orazio, 117
 Wessels' Mantuanus de Calamitatibus Temporum, 118
 Review of Gummere's Seneca, 446
 Walters' Classical Dictionary, 211-212
- NICHOLS, EDWARD W. Review of Housman's Manilius, 206-207
 Nicopolis in Epirus, 329
 Nihil quod tetigit non ornavit, 460-462
- Olympian Chronicle, 108
 Orthagorids of Sicyon, 330
 Oscan Inscription (Glans Saepinas), 331
 Ovid's Metamorphoses, when composed, 213
- Paulus Silentarius, 42-72; 247
 Pausanias and the periegetic form of his work, 215
 Penthemimeral caesura, 215
 Persius V 165-166, 111
 Petronius, Critical Notes on, 102
 Petrarch's Secretum, 332
 and the wine of Meroe, 312-314
 Philodemus *περί εὐσεβείας* restored, 109
 Phoutrides' Chorus in Euripides (mentioned), 341
 Pindar, Quoted and slighted, 340
 P. 3. 52 (schol.), 217
 8, 48-55, 220
 9, 82-83 discussed, 335
 11, 55 (em.), 331
 I. 2, 8, 110
 Pisistratus' body-guard, 448
 Plataea, Topography of, 217
 Plato, Phaedrus and the Vin-dobonensis 54, 104
 Laws 960 c (em.), 104
 Rpb. 304 c (em.), 104
 Timaeus, Proclus' Commentary on, 105
 Plautus, Plot of the Epidicus of, 237-264
 Plebs, Origin of the, 452
 Pliny on the history of art, 329
 A lost work of, 217
 N. H. 35. 71, 164
 Plotinus, not an emanationist, 448
 Plutarch, Cim. 18 (em.), 482
- POE, E. A. Puzzling passage (em.), 114
 Polybius, 6, 19, 2, 100
 Pompeius Trogus and Justinus, 19-41
 Preston's Sermo Amatorius in Roman Comedy, 328
 PROKOSCH, E. Slavic *togo*, 432-434
 Prosecution of Lifeless Things and Animals in Greek Law, 151-175; 285-303
 Ptolemy and Heron, 216
- Quadi, 217
- Recent Publications, 119-121; 233-234; 347-348; 462-463
 Reduplication in Tagalog, 425-431
 Religious Burlesque in Aristophanes and elsewhere, 176-185
- Reports:
 Hermes, 213-218; 447-452
 Revue de Philologie, 100-109; 329-330
 Rheinisches Museum, 106-109
 Rivista di Filologia, 218-221; 330-332; 452-453
- Reviews:
 Byrne's Ausonius, 320-331
 Bouchier, Syria as a Roman Province, 320-321
 Cocchia, Romanzo e realtà nella vita e nell'attività di Lucio Apuleio, 317-318
 Cooper's Concordance to Horace, 323-328
 Cuq, Locaux affectés à l'habitation dans la Rome impériale, 96-98
 Dottin, Les anciens peuples de l'Europe, 443-445
 Ernout's Recueil de textes Latins Archaiques, 208-209
 Lucrèce l. 4, 322-323
 Fowler's Virgil's Gathering of the Clans, 209-211
 Fox's Greek and Roman Mythology (rev.), 88-93
 Gummere's Seneca, 446
 Housman's Manilius, 206-207
 Marchesi's Apuleius de Magia, 203-204
 Preston's Sermo Amatorius in Roman Comedy, 328
 Quackenbos' Sanskrit Poems of Mayūra, 435-441
 Shaksperian Studies of Columbia University, 93-96

- Stampini's *Il Codice Bresciano di Catullo*, 98-99
 Studi, 116
 Vespucci Reprints, 318-319
 Walters' Classical Dictionary, 211-212
 Wells' Manual of the Writings in Middle English, 441-443
 Winter's Prodomus of Nicolaus Steno, 201-203
Revue de Philologie, Report of, 100-109; 330-332
Rheinisches Museum, Report of, 106-109
 Rhetorical Elements in Livy's Direct Speeches, 125-151
 Rhodes, Founders of, 216
 Rhyme Words in Vulgar Latin Onomatopoeias, 265-284
Rivista di Filologia, Report of, 218-221; 330-332; 447-452
 Roberts, Rhys, Patriotic Poetry in Greek and English (mentioned), 223
 Rome, Inhabited portions of Imperial, 93-96
 Roman Comedy, *Sermo Amatorius* in, 328
 St. Gall Glossary, The, 349-369
 SANDERS, HENRY N. Note on Aristophanes Av. 1313, 232
 Scipio Africanus and Hannibal, Dialogue between, 213
 Seleucus Nicator, Closing years of his reign, 221
 Sellasia, Topography of, 217
 Seneca, Critical Contributions to N. Q., 108
Epistulae Morales, Gummere's (rev.), 446
 Shaksperian Studies (rev.), 93-96
 SLAUGHTER, M. S. Review of Bouchier's *Syria as a Roman Province*, 321-322
 Fowler's *Virgil's Gathering of the Clans*, 209-211
 Slavic *togo*, 432-434
 SMITH, KIRBY FLOWER. Report of *Rivista di Filologia*, 218-221; 230-232; 452-453
 Reviews:
 Butler and Owen's *Apulei Apologia*, 204-205
 Byrne's *Ausonius*, 320-321
 Cocchia's *Lucio Apuleio*, 317-318
 Marchesi's *Apuleius de Magia*, 203-204
 Preston's *Sermo Amatorius* in Roman Comedy, 328
 Vespucci Reprints, 318-319
 Sobriquet and Stem, 82-87
 Sophocles '*Ἰχθυόειρα*', *Hermes* Lyre in, 214
 Recurrent Words in, 337
 Trach. 554, 104
 Speeches, Rhetorical Elements in Livy's Direct, 125-151
 Spoil in Homeric Poems, Disposition of, 188-193
 Stampini's *Il Codice Bresciano di Catullo* (rev.), 98-99;
 Studi di letteratura e filologia latina (mentioned), 116
 Stanley's, Dean, misquotation of Johnson on Goldsmith, 461-462
 Steadman's *Historical Present in English* (mentioned), 342
 STEELE, R. B. Pompeius Trogus and Justinus, 19-41
 Stem, Sobriquet and, 82-87
 Syria as a Roman Province, 321-322
 Tacitus, Ann. II, 88, 216
 TATLOCK, JOHN S. P. Review of Wells' Manual of the Writings in the Middle English, 441-443
 Thayer's Influence of Horace upon the Chief English Poets of the Nineteenth Century (mentioned), 116
 Terence, *Andria*, 102
 Thomson's Studies in the *Odyssey* (mentioned), 222, 333
 Tibullus, *Brescian Codex* of, 98-99
 Timotheus, The Persians of, 214
 Thucydides and History, Hutton's (mentioned), 338
 Speeches in, 259
togo, Slavic, 432-434
 TUTTLE, EDWIN H. Aryan *pitar-* and Dravidian **pitar-*, 315-316
 ULLMAN, B. L. Review of Stampini's *Il Codice Bresciano di Catullo*, 98-99
 Ussani's *Satire di Orazio* (mentioned), 117
 Valla, Laurentius, Rutilius Namatianus and, 219

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------|-----------------------------|---------|
| Varro M. T., | 108 | Wells' Manual of the Writ- | |
| on the hexameter, | 452 | ings in Middle English | |
| Vedic Cruces, | 1-18 | (rev.), | 441-443 |
| Vediovis, the Volcanic God, | 370-391 | Wessels' Mantuanus de Cala- | |
| | 318-319 | mitatibus Temporum | |
| Vespucchi Reprints, | 103 | (mentioned), | 118 |
| Virgil, Bucolics, | 452 | WHEELER, ARTHUR LESLIE. | |
| Ecl. 4, 62 (discussed), | | The Plot of the Epidicus, | |
| Gathering of the Clans | | | 237-264 |
| (Aen. VII, 601-817), | 209-211 | Winter's Prodrömus of Nico- | |
| Vitellius, Praetorians of, | 100 | laus Steno (rev.), | 201-203 |
| Walters' Classical Dictionary | | Xenophon, Mem. IV 4, | 219 |
| (rev.), | 211-212 | Zomino, | 453 |

G. E. STECHERT & CO.

(ALFRED HAFNER)

PUBLISHERS AND IMPORTERS

OF

BOOKS AND PERIODICALS

151-155 West 25th Street, New York.

Branches at Leipzig, London and Paris.

We carry a large line of imported books and receive new publications as soon as issued. Any book not on hand will be imported as soon as present conditions permit.

Our stock of Standard Foreign Books and of second-hand books is the largest carried by any house in the United States and we are equipped to handle promptly and intelligently all orders for American and Foreign publications.

We enumerate a few items from our large stock:

Busolt, G. Griechische Geschichte. 3 vols. bound in 4. (I & II in 2. ed.) 1893-1904. 1/2 mor.....	\$ 10.00
Cicero. Merguet, H. Lexicon zu den Reden d. Cicero. 4 vols. 1877-1884. 1/2 mor.....	35.00
Corssen, W. Aussprache, Vokalismus u. Betonung der latein. Sprache. 2. ed. 2 vols. 1868-70. Buckram.....	10.00
Curtius, G. Studien zur Griech. u. Latein. Grammatik. 10 vols. bound in 7. 1868-78. 1/2 mor.....	10.00
Duncker, M. History of Antiquity. Trans. by Abbott. 6 vols. 1877-82. cloth.....	15.00
Henry, J. Aeneidea. 4 vols. London, 1873. 1/2 calf. Nice set. Rare.....	20.00
Josephus, F. Works, transl. by Whiston. 4 vols. bound in 3, with portrait and illustr. 1893. 1/2 polished calf, fine set.....	10.00
Kraus, F. X. Realencyclopaedie der christlichen Altertümer. 2 vols. Illustr. Freiburg, 1882-86, 1/2 roan (binding shelve worn). Rare.....	17.50
Kuehner, R. Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache. 2 vols. bound in 3. 1877-79. 1/2 mor.....	7.00
Marquardt & Mommsen. Handbuch der römischen Altertümer. 7 vols. bound in 9. (1 & 2 in 2. ed.) 1876-87. 1/2 mor.....	9.00
Musaici cristiani e saggi dei pavimenti delle chiese di Roma anteriori al secolo XV. 53 mostly colored plates. Ed. by G. Battista de Rossi. Roma, 1899. 1/2 mor., folio.....	165.00
Perrot & Chipiez. Art in Primitive Greece. 2 vols. With numerous illustr. London, 1894. Cloth, large 8vo.....	10.00
Perrot & Chipiez. History of Art in Ancient Egypt. 2 vols. With numerous illustr. London, 1883. 1. 8vo, cloth.....	12.00
Wilmanns G. Exempla inscriptionum latinarum in usum academ. 2 vols. and Index. Berol. 1873. 1/2 mor. Rare.....	8.00



The Lord Baltimore Press

FORMERLY THE FRIEDENWALD CO.

Printers

Lithographers

Book Binders

Greenmount Avenue and Oliver Street

BALTIMORE, MD., U. S. A.

=====
Printers of the American Journal of Philology, American Journal of Mathematics,
Memoirs from the Biological Laboratory, and other Works
Issued by the Johns Hopkins University.

=====
HIGHEST STANDARD OF WORK
LOWEST PRICES FOR THE STANDARD

Harvard Studies in Classical Philology

VOLUME XXVIII

Boards. 228 pages. \$1.50

Edited by a Committee of the Classical Instructors in Harvard University; HERBERT WEIR SMYTH, Ph. D., Eliot Professor of Greek Literature; EDWARD KENNARD RAND, Ph. D., Professor of Latin; and CHANDLER RATHFON POST, Ph. D., Assistant Professor of Greek and of Fine Arts.

CONTENTS

On the Second Book of Aristotle's Poeticus and the Source of Theophrastus' Definition of Tragedy, by A. Philip McMahon.

Chaucer's Lollius, by George Lyman Kittredge.

The Exposition of the Drama by Æschylus, by B. Evelyn Spring.

Summary of Dissertations for the Degree of Ph. D., 1916-17. Indexes.

May be Ordered Through any Dealer.

Send to Publisher for the Contents of Previous Volumes.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS

38 Randall Hall, Cambridge, Mass.

STUDIES IN HONOR

OF

PROFESSOR GILDERSLEEVE

This volume contains 527 pages together with a photogravure of Professor Gildersleeve. It includes 44 separate papers.

The volume is dedicated to Professor Gildersleeve in commemoration of the Seventieth Anniversary of his birth by his pupils.

Most of the edition of the volume was subscribed for in advance of issue. The few copies remaining will be sold at the price of \$6.00 (six dollars) each.

Orders may be addressed to

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

BALTIMORE, MARYLAND.

The Johns Hopkins Press of Baltimore

- American Journal of Insanity.** H. M. HURD, E. N. BRUSH, G. A. BLUMER, J. M. MOSHER and C. K. CLARKE, Editors. Quarterly. 8vo. Volume LXXIV in progress. \$5 per volume. (Foreign postage, fifty cents.)
- American Journal of Mathematics.** Edited by FRANK MORLEY, with the coöperation of A. COHEN, CHARLOTTE A. SCOTT and other mathematicians. Quarterly. 4to. Volume XXXIX in progress. \$6 per volume. (Foreign postage, fifty cents.)
- American Journal of Philology.** Edited by B. L. GILDERSLEEVE and C. W. E. MILLER. Quarterly. 8vo. Volume XXXVIII in progress. \$3 per volume. (Foreign postage, fifty cents.)
- Beiträge zur Assyriologie und semitischen Sprachwissenschaft.** PAUL HAUPT and FRIEDRICH DELITZSCH, Editors. Volume X in progress.
- Elliott Monographs in the Romance Languages and Literatures.** E. C. ARMSTRONG, Editor. 8vo. \$3 per series. Three numbers have appeared.
- Hesperia.** HERMANN COLLITZ, HENRY WOOD and JAMES W. BRIGHT, Editors. Eleven numbers have appeared.
- Johns Hopkins Hospital Bulletin.** Monthly. 4to. Volume XXVIII in progress. \$3 per year. (Foreign postage, fifty cents.)
- Johns Hopkins Hospital Reports.** 8vo. Volume XVIII in progress. \$5 per volume. (Foreign postage, fifty cents.)
- Johns Hopkins University Circular,** including the President's Report, Annual register, and Medical Department Catalogue. T. R. BALL, Editor. Monthly. 8vo. \$1 per year.
- Johns Hopkins University Studies in Education.** Edited by E. F. BUCHNER and C. M. CAMPELL. 8vo. Two numbers have appeared.
- Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science.** Under the direction of the Departments of History, Political Economy, and Political Science. Monthly. 8vo. Volume XXXV in progress. \$3.50 per volume.
- Modern Language Notes.** J. W. BRIGHT, Editor-in-Chief, M. P. BRUSH, W. KURRELMAYER, G. GRUENBAUM and J. E. SHAW. Eight times yearly. 8vo. Volume XXXII in progress. \$3 per volume. (Foreign postage, fifty cents.)
- Reprint of Economic Tracts.** J. H. HOLLANDER, Editor. Fourth series in progress. \$2.00.
- Reports of the Maryland Geological Survey.** Edited by W. B. CLARK.
- Terrestrial Magnetism and Atmospheric Electricity.** L. A. BAUER, Editor. Quarterly. 8vo. Vol. XXII in progress. \$3 per volume. (Foreign postage, twenty-five cents.)
-
- POEMA DE FERNAN GONÇALEZ.** Edited by C. Carroll Marden. 284 pp. 8vo. \$2.50.
- STUDIES IN HONOR OF PROFESSOR GILDERSLEEVE.** 527 pp. 8vo. \$6.
- STUDIES IN HONOR OF A. MARSHALL ELLIOTT.** Two volumes. 8vo. 450 and 334 pp. \$7.50.
- ECCLESIASTES: A NEW METRICAL TRANSLATION.** By Paul Haupt. 50 pp. 8vo. 50 cents.
- THE BOOK OF NAHUM: A METRICAL TRANSLATION.** By Paul Haupt. 53 pp. 8vo. 50 cents.
- THE HAGUE PEACE CONFERENCES OF 1899 AND 1907.** By James Brown Scott. Vol. I, The Conferences, 887 pp.; Vol. II, Documents, 548 pp. 8vo. \$5.
- THE ECLOGUES OF BAPTISTA MANTUANUS.** By W. P. Mustard. 156 pp. 8vo. \$1.50.
- THE PISCATORY ECLOGUES OF JACOPO SANNAZARO.** By W. P. Mustard. 94 pp. 8vo. \$1.
- THE CREED OF THE OLD SOUTH.** By B. L. Gildersleeve. 128 pp. Crown 8vo. \$1.
- THE TAIL OF RAUP COILYEAR.** Edited by William Hand Browne. 164 pp. 8vo. \$1.
- SELECTIONS FROM THE EARLY SCOTTISH POETS.** By William H. Browne. 164 pp. 8vo. \$1.

A complete list of publications sent on request.

